which she hands us over to the mercies of the savage arab hordes, after we have sunk in the conversion of this God-forsaken wilderness into a habitable land some of our most precious possessions -- human lives and age-long hopes. I can visualize the consummation of this piece of cruelty as little as I can visualize death. So long as one lives one cannot help but hope. Ultimately I think the prophet who said (p.295)

will be vindicated.

I still believe that before all else we Jews ought to answer ourselves the question To what end? What are we Jews for? Without some kind of a satisfying answer, our condition ceases to be even tragic, and becomes completely meaningless. There can be no evil greater than meaningless suffering. I say that we must redeem this suffering of its meaninglessness and I don't think it is so difficult. The existence of mankind as a whole, bound up as it is with every conceivable evil, would appear nothing less than a cosmic error, if we were not to attach significance to consciousness, spirit, mind, reason, a significance that all the infinite universes of dead matter cannot destroy. If man thus dares affirm his right to existence in the face of a vast universe that woke him to life only to crush him with its infinite ponderousness. why should not the Jew have the courage to defy the savage element of mankind that seeks to annihilate him? It is man's function to assert the right of the mind to exist. So it is the Jew's function to assert the right of human individuality, which is the most important expression of the mind. The minority status to which Jews seem to be condemned is the opportunity which the Jew must exploit to affirm the right of the human being to be something else besides being a creature of the herd, to be himself. This human dignity, which it has fallen upon the Jew to defend, is what the Jew should live for as a Jew.

* * *

Saturday night, May 27, 1939

I attach very little significance to the demonstrations that were held here during the last weekend. They belong unfortunately to the class of necessary evils. If they had not been held, it would have appeared as if we were too weak or too cowardly even to object. As a matter of fact, the very statement of the White Paper is an invitation to violence. Does it not say that its provisions will go into effect if the two peoples will show that they can live together in peace? The logical conclusions that if they don't want those provisions to go into effect, they should shed each others' blood. England is in this respect true to form: Divide and rule.

But as far as we are concerned all this business of trying to negotiate with England or with America to get them to support us in our efforts is futile. To this type of negotiation the teaching of the prophets who deprecated political alliances and intrigues with the imperial nations applies even today. The antithesis of the policy of political negotiation is planned cooperation with the natives. By "planned" I mean not the setting up of ideal aims which are at present unrealizable. The vast difference in standards of living rules out immediate large scale cooperation in employing Arab labor and buying indiscriminately from them. But it does not rule out gradual cooperation by introducing such measures as Kalvarisky has been advocating for years, viz: organization of groups comprising in the farm areas, Jews and Arabs for purposes like the following: credit loans, publication of agricultural information, engaging physicians, opening schools where Hebrew would be taught to Arabic children. The trouble with the (p.296)
is that it is run by the Histadrut and is more like a Zionist propaganda paper to Arabic speaking Jews than a paper that represents the Jewish side of the case from the standpoint of Arabic interests. (I learned incidentally that Brandeis contributed $10,000 toward it) I owe most of

of the foregoing ideas about Jewish-Arab relations to talks I have had with Manyeh Shohet of the old (p.296) of the 2nd aliyah and Kalvarisky, formerly of the who reorganized Baron Rothschild's colonies with a view to eliminating he element of dependence to which the colonists had become used. Kalvarisky is undoubtedly right in what he said to me this afternoon "This blow (the White Paper) has come to us because of our failure to treat with the Arabs."

Kalvarisky and Manye Shohet maintain that even now it is not too late to proceed with the plan of cooperating with the Arabs. They both pointed out to me the mistake in Magnes' approach. His idea is that the Jews should treat with the Mufti and his gang which consists to a large extent of Effendi youth. Their operations have been instigaged and financed at first by Mussolini and later also by Hitler with the purpose of making trouble for England and spreading Fascism.

The (p.297) or "Educational Conference" which was to be held Thursday and Friday of last week under the auspices of the University was called off about two weeks ago, because of the lack of response on the part of outsiders who had been invited to take part in it, and because of the tension in the country due to the expected announcement of the White Paper.

In the preparation of the sereis of lectures for Chicago I am now writing out the lecture on Conservative Judaism. I believe I see Conservative Judaism in a truer light than I did when I wrote the chapter on it in my book "Judaism as a Civilization."

* * *

Monday, May 29, 1939

It is 11:20 at night. Lena had just fallen asleep when the bell rings excitedly and Mrs. Feigenbaum our neighbor having just come back from town informs us that two Jews were shot dead in Bezalel St. in the alley behind one of the large cooperative apartments on King George Road, and that a bomb exploded in the Rex Wirre House killing a number of Jews and Arabs. We had heard the explosion when it occurred about 8:20 but we naturally explained it away as caused by automobile exhaast pipes.

* * *

Tuesday, May 30, 1939

I had a nightmare during the night. I dreamt that three Arabs tried to trip me and were preparing to shoot me.

For the first time in my life I delivered a full length lecture today on Humor as part of the course in "Principles of Education," and it wasn't bad at that. One of the students had read a paper on "Humor and its place in Education." There wasn't much to what he said. My talk was based on the assumption that the most predominant form of humor consists in the destruction of xxxxxxx somebody's hierarchy of values. The ancients allowed humor only at the expense of individuals whose hierarchy of values was anti-social or based on deception of self or of others. Nowadays we should utilize humor to undermine the hierarchy of values of vested interests and established traditions which stand in the way of general happiness and progress. For that reason I suggested that the entire discussion of the place of humor in education falls under the category of "Intelligence."

Could anything describe more neatly the difference between the traditional conception of salvation and the conception implied in conservative Judaism than the following two phrases taken from Edman's

"The Contemporary and His Soul:" "The safest refuge from time is eternity;" (p.79)"the safest refuge from the present is the past" (p.105). Nothing hits off so smartly the attitude of the historical in Judaism as the title of Ch. V in that book, "Nostalgia for Tradition."

* * *

Tuesday, June 6, 1939

Last weekend was again one of tension and fear. This was due to a number of outrages which had been committed on Friday. In the morning a time bomb exploded near the Jaffa Gate killing 6 and wounding 19.Arabs. In the course of the day several bombs exploded in manholes and destroyed the telephone system of the greater part of the town-planning section of the city. As a punitive measure all the cinema houses and cafes were closed and most of the Jewish buses, except the one to the University were stopped.

With Dushkin also giving up his position at the University and coming to N.Y. to direct the Fredsam education fund, the authroities here have stopped dilly-dallying with the question of who is to succeed me, and have been unusually active in trying to fill both vacancies, Dushkin's and mine. Buber apparently has no ambitions in this direction; so his name was eliminated. Roth's chances are slim, because of the reluctance to takehim out of the philosophy department and because of his own uncertainty whether he would want to go into education. At the meeting of the Pedagogic committee which met at my house last week, with Schnabe as Chairman, the candidacy of Eliezer Rieger and Ernst Simon was passed upon, the former for Suhkin's place and the latter for mine. There are two people on the Executive Committee, Ussishkin and Berl Katzenhan who arerooting for Touroff and the Pedagogic Committee met yesterday with a subcomittee of the Executive for Schocken's library for the express purpose of explaining why it did not consider Touroff eligible.

Schocken conducted the meeting in Hebrew and only occasionally had to make sure that he used the right word. For a man of his age to have acquired the language to that extent is remarkable. In general he impresses me as an intelligent though hard man. What annoys me about the administrative and executive aspect of the University is how completely out of the picture Magnes is.

As I am writing this - about 9:30 in the morning - I hear the machine gun practice, which has become frequent of late. It sounds exactly like the riveting one hears in New York when the apartment houses or skyscrapers are being put up.

In thinking of what I shall have to say tomorrow about ~~xxx~~ Simon vs. Roth for the course on the Principles of Education it occurred to me that the reason I had suggested ~~xxxx~~ Roth as a suitable candidate is that he is an Aristotelian in his outlook. It has probably been noted before but I feel very strongly the fact that all types of human thinking fall into the one or the other categories viz: Platonic or Aristotelian. In the Middle Ages Realism and Nominalism was the main issue. It seems that Aristotelian thinking in England was landed in a bog by Hume. In Germany it was lifted on Platonic wings by Kant and given great propelling force by Hegel etc. The only constructive Aristotelian thinking in recent times has been done in America, led mainly by Dewey.

What has all this to do with the candidate for the course in "Principles of Ed." Very simple. I wanted it to be given by a man who is Aristotelian in his thinking. I'm sure I shall not succeed in that, because Simon is the much preferred candidate, and he is a Hegelian to the roots of his hair (which has a lot of on his body but none on his head - symbolic indeed for Hegelians who think with their ~~blodd~~ and not with their brains.)

* * *

Thursday, June 8, 1939

I attended yesterday the meeting of the University Senate. The greater part of the meeting was devoted to the discussion of the candidacy of Touroff and Simon for the courses in "Principles of Education." There was no question raised as to Rieger's fitness for "Educational Methods." Roth's name was bandied about a bit, and Sholem had occasion to say that he has to meet anyone whom Roth has either influenced or inspired. But the sparks flew when Touroff's name was discussed. In the report of the special committee, which was signed by Dushkin, Schwabe and me, Touroff was definitely described as unqualified for the position. Klausner and Sukenick broke more than one lance in his behalf. Torcyner put in a good word for him and Asaf spoke in his favor very half heartedly as if for some political reason he had to. The other speakers, about eight or nine, advocated the choice of Simon. Klausner kept on raging and interrupting. He certainly does succeed in making an ass of himself. The final vote on Simon vs. Touroff was 20-6.

Although I do not see eye to eye with Simon in his philosophical approach - which is Platonic-Hegelian - I have faith in him as a person. His identification with the "Brith Shalom" is to me a high recommendation, though Ussishkin will probably fight his appointment just because of that. I am very happy that both Simon and Rieger will continue to work which Dushkin and I have begun, because I feel that it is in very good hands now, and that our having been here has served the purpose of breaking down the tradition about prophets not being recognized in their own home-town. These two men I feel confident, will make an important contribution to the Jewish educational system here.

As a result of my work on the "Modern Trends in Judaism," I have discovered that the Jewish people, in its struggle for existence, has resorted for survival to values which are not only the product of the

Zeitgeist, but generally to those which are appealed to by its enemies to justify their hostility. The most recent illustration of that practice is the resort to the values of nationalism.

* * *

Friday, June 9, 1939

Last night at 9:45 as I was sitting and working I heard a series of loud explosions. Lena and I went out on the back veranda to see what happened. There was nothing to be seen except continuous flashes from a searchlight coming from the north westerly direction and the glimmer of what looked like a conflagaration somewhere in the center of the town. The electric lights in the house flickered for a moment. This morning I learned that the electric workers were bombed and that a third of the city was plunged into darkness.

The interesting thing is the way Lena and I tried to make nothing of the explosion. She said it was thunder. This was suggested to her by Naomi's letter which said that a few days ago it thundered and lightened in Beirut. And I said the explosions were due to fireworks in honor of the King's birthday, which was yesterday.

I have been reading and thinking intensively for the better part of the last week on Nationalist Judaism. I found a great deal that is stimulating to the mind but depressing to the spirit in Ezekiel Kaufmann's "Golah Venekar." But I can't understand why he devotes considerable space to Smolenskin and mentions Herzl only in passing. Herzl's name isn't even in the index.

I believe that the classification which I have at list hit upon -- Idealist Nationalism and Realist Nationalism - ought to bring some order into the mass of facts and ideologies pertaining to Jewish nationalism. I define Idealist Nationalism as that theory which bases the need for activating Jewish nationhood on spiritual and ethical values

assumed as inhering in nationhood and Realist Nationhood as the theory which bases the need for motivating Jewish nationhood upon the status of alienage which is bound to adhere to the Jews because they are not rooted in the land in which they dwell and upon the consequent inevitability of chronic anti-Semitism.

* * *

(From back fly-leaf)

"It is no more possible to argue with the Nazi state of mind than with the germ of some foul disease. It must be considered as a Thing, no more capable of reason and decency than dirt. Civilized human beings find it offensive even as a topic of discussion, but must discuss it because it is there, swollen and horrible to sight, smell and intelligence, right outside the window of the homes of the human race and beginning to spread disease." Westbrook Pegler in N.Y.World, Wed. Nov. 16, 1938 (copied in Jerusalem Dec. 19, 1938)

I ask myself why I keep this journal...I say to myself that hereafter in these pages it will be as if memory had fashioned itself into a friend who has heard my confidences and can respond with sympathy. It is an attempt also to fix the fluid insubstantiality of the spirit." Paul Elmer More, Pages from an Oxford Diary VIII (copied in Jerusalem, Jan. 3, 1939)

When I am on speaking terms with myself I record in the Journal. (Feb. 19, 1939, Jerusalem)

"Am Vorabend des Jom Kippur pflegten die Söhne und Töchter des Rabbi Jacob Israel vom Kremnitz in das Haus ihren vaters za kommen, un seinen Segen zu empfangen. Einmal versäumte sich eine der Töchter. Sie merkte dass sie den Rabbi nicht mehr daheim funden warde, lief zum

Bet-ha-Midrasch und stellte sich am Tor auf, danit er sie vor dem eintreten segne. Ihr jüngstes kind, einen Knaben von fünf Jahren, hielt sie in Arm. Als der Vater kam, sah er sie am Tor stehen und bitterlich weinen, und auch das kind in ihrem Arm weinte. Er fragte es: "Warum weinst du?" Schluchzend antwortete der Knabe: "Ich sehe dass meine Mutter weint darum weine ich." Rabbi Jacob Israel trat in das Bethaus, schritt vor die Lade und erzählte in Tränen der Gemeinde, was ihm widerfahren war. Dann sprach er: "Der Knabe sah, dass seine Mutter weinte, da mussate auch er weinen. Und wir - weiss unsere Seele nicht, dass die Shechina in verborgenen weint?" Da nam uber die ganze Gemeinde das grosse Weinen der Umkehr." Martin Bubin - Gabe-Herr Rabbine, Dr. Kobel.

copied March 1, 1939

The foregoing had the same effect on me as on the congregation but it was not the "weeping of repentance" but of the shekinah itself.

"Amid the presence of great events a general principle gives no help." Hegel Philosophy of History, (Introd. p. 6)

copied Sat. nt. March 18, 1939.

* * *

VOLUME IX, June 11, 1939-Oct. 28, 1940

"A Tale of Tempests in Teapots"

from flyleaf:

The reward of being simple and sincere with what seem the facts of one's universe is that one sheds abroad an influence that may be incalculable." Havelock Ellis, copied Sept. 9/39

"...like as a parchment put into our hands that we might write thereon our human thought, less for its long preservation than for the self-clarification which expression yields." A.B. Alexander, Sept.27/39

"Now it happens curiously enough with philosophical mediations, that precisely that which one has thought out and investigated for oneself is afterward of benefit to others; not that, however, which was originally intended for others." Schopenhauer, Preface to his works. copied Nov. 7/39

"Without being an enemy of virtue, a cool observer, one that does not mistake the wish for good, however lively, for its reality, may sometimes doubt whether true virtue is actually found anywhere in the world, and this especially as the years increase and the judgment is partly made wiser by experience and partly also more acute in observation."

Kant, the Metaphysic of Morals, p. 24 in Theory of Ethics, trans. by Abbot, copied Jan 3/40

"Illustrating what it means for conscious personality to be aware that it is but a part of a whole or a smaller circle contained in a bigger one Jung adds, "A little bank clerk, showing a friend around town points out the bank building saying 'And here is my bank.'" Carl Gustav Jung, Psych. & Religion, p. 47. copied Jan. 8/40

It would be a difficult task to reconcile the picture I have of myself with the one which other people make of me. Who is right? And who is the real individual? When we go further and take into account the fact that man is also what neither he himself nor other people know of him - an unknown something which yet can be proved to exist --

the problem of identity becomes more difficult still." Ibid., p. 100, copied Jan. 9/40

"The individual engagements are won by the men of action, but the campaigns by thinkers." Feb. 16/40

"Carlyle said of Teufelsdrockh that after a period of ragings and despairings over a soul-tragedy "the first mad paroxysm past... he collected his dismembered philosophies and buttoned himself together! Some of our psychoneurotic patients must be told quite bluntly to do just that. And, to quote still further, they may well be asked "What is it...thou hast been fretting and fuming and lamenting and self tormenting an account of? Is it not because thou art not happy? Because thou (sweet gentleman) are not sufficiently honored, nourished, soft-bedded and lovingly cared for? Foolish soul! What act of legislature was there that thou shouldst be happy? A little while ago thou hadst no right to be at all." Journal A.M.A. copied Sat., Feb. 24/40

"Acquaintance" By this is meant the schooling oneself not to expect too much of life or of the people among whom one lives, learning that 'we aim at the unattainable and must be content with finding broken pieces' accepting courageously disappointment and defeat and joyously fighting on with only the acquisition of quiet wisdom as one's reward." Ibid.

"The Babylonian light-god Marduk descended unrecognized to do battle with Tiamat, the monster of Chaos."

From Encycl. of Ethics & Religion VI, 237. copied 3/14/40

"Ducunt fata volentem, nolentem trahunt."

God is not reflected in nature; He is refracted. (July 23/40)

Last night about 9 o'clock we heard two bombs go off. Half an hour afterwards we learned that they exploded at the new post office here.

This morning-one of those rare June mornings - I was walking to Dr. Gutmann, who had given me inoculations for my hay fever from April 12 to May 26, to pay what I owed him. As I got to Jaffa Road I was thinking how the human mind loves equilibrium. Before the bombs explode one doesn't like to think about them, and after they explode one feels like after lightning. "Now that the mischief is done it probably won't be repeated." When I got to the doctor I asked him to make up the account of what I owed him. Before I was with him two minutes he told me that only about a half hour ago another bomb had exploded at the post office, and that the British soldiers had cordoned off the Zichron Moshe quarter and were searching it since 4 A.M. at which time they entered Yellin's house.

From the doctor who lives on Rehov ~~Nebrim~~ Nevi'im I went to get a hair cut and from the barber's I went to take my music lesson with Miss Berlin (Mrs. Rapish) at the Cooperative Apartment on King George Road. From there I went to the University and arranged with Schneersohn about getting back the amount deducted from my salary for pension. When I came home I found the men packing the books and furniture for our trip back to America.

The extension of democracy has released powerful currents of human energy which mankind knows even less how to direct toward beneficent ends than it knows how to direct the physical energy released by science and technology.

* * *

Tuesday, June 13, 1939

This afternoon I brought to a close my two years' work at the University. I think that, on the whole, I have reason to be satisfied with the results for myself of the study I have made of the history and principles of education, and with the results for a number of students who took the work seriously. It is really too much to expect that very many of them should take the pedagogy courses seriously first, because they receive no academic credit for them, and secondly, they are overburdened with studies besides having to do outside work to pay their way through the university.

I took leave this afternoon of Yishak Epstein. He is one of those who laid the foundation of Hebrew education here, and a high minded personality. The frightful misconduct of our people here at the present time, which like that of our zealots and gangsteers (p.1) of old, is destroying our chances of survival, is weighing heavily on his mind. He is old and his strength is failing. He wept when I said goodbye to him. It was all I could do to restrain myself from weeping.

It was he who told me that five Arabs were killed this morning at Haifa by a bomb.

Mrs. Lindheim was over to see us on Sunday. Her stoicism is beyond my power to comprehend. A few weeks ago she lost her oldest son, after the latter had lost his wife in an airplane accident a few months before. Her son Donald came here recently from the U.S. and brought with him, she said in a matter of fact way, the remains of her two ?p.2 husband and son. Thinking that there was to be a burial, Lena asked when the interment would take place. "No," said Mrs. Lindheim "They were both cremated. The ashes will be deposited in a most beautiful spot she has chosen for that purpose in Mishmar ha-

Emek, where she has her home. Where does she get her moral or spiritual courage? Is it nerves or mind? Can it be willed, or is it inborn? Is it normal and desirable or abnormal and undesirable? But who knows the answers to all these questions?

The whole town is agog with the repudiation of Touroff's candidacy for either of the two vacancies in the Education Dept. of the University here. And the one who is causing all the trouble is the "iron man" Ussishkin. Dr. Schwabe has been in to see me twice today to ask my advice, and tomorrow at 9:00 A.M. I have to meet Schocken to discuss the possible developments of the "Affaire Touroff."

We have annexed "bombs bursting in air" to our Jewish national anthem.

In all the time that Lena and I have been here we have managed to retain our equilibrium. Both of us have had our ups and downs. When Lena had her ups I had my downs, and vice versa.

* * *

Wednesday, June 14, 1939

The visit to Schochen this morning began with the discussion of the petty politics which Ussishkin started in order to get Touroff into the University and it ended with the unfolding of a far flung plan. I approved, as a way out of the Touroff muddle, the suggestion that he be added to the pedagogy department as a liason officer between the University and the various educational bodies, and in that way bring the pedagogy department into close touch with the needs of the land. When we were through with this matter Schochen wanted to know my opinion of the plan which is being sponsored by Profs. Asaf, Klein and Albeck with the cooperation of Chief Rabbi Herzog and his entourage to estab-

lish a rabbinical department in the University. The understanding, of course, is that it is to train men for the Orthodox rabbinate. Profs. Guttman and Sholem are strenuously opposed to such a move. They are afraid it would hamper their freedom. Ussishkin and Schochen are likewise opposed. In my opinion, which I voiced to Schochen, it would be a mistake for the University to ignore the rabbinic training altogether but it would also be a mistake for the University to confine itself to one type of rabbinic training. The much wiser policy would be to have the various religious trends or at least the Reformist and the Conservative as well as the Orthodox represented in the rabbinic department. To that end, as well as for the general good of Jewish life, it would be advisable that the University should become the center of the network of the rabbinic training schools in the diaspora and make arrangements whereby students would be able to take courses both at the University and either finish or begin their studies at one or the other of the rabbinical seminaries in Golut. If our people had vision, what tremendous possibilities for the unity and development of Jewish life could be realized through such a plan!

As I am now reading Ahad Ha-am's Essays again for the lecture on Jewish nationalism, I see how little I realized what an Ahad Ha-amist I was when I wrote Judaism as a Civilization. I always recognized that Ahad Ha-Am influenced my thinking, but I thought that I carried out the implications of his ideas much further than he did. I now see that most of those implications are strewn throughout his essays.

* * *

Thursday, June 15, 1939

Just came from Schocken's where the question of the part the University should take in the establishment of rabbinic courses was discussed. Besides Schocken and myself there were Profs. Asaf and

Casuto. Asaf gave an account of the steps being taken by the group consisting of himself, Profs. Klein, Albeck and Aptowitzer to start a sort of rabbinic institute with about 10 students, this coming fall. Casuto, who like Asaf wore a cap during the conference, gave a long winded talk about the value of the work, but evidently didn't grasp the main point at issue, which Schocken had stated and which I developed further; namely: whether the University should permit ~~to~~ the proposed rabbinic institute to be organized independenly of the University. I was quite emphatic in pointing out that it would be a mistake for the University to let go so golden an opportunity of serving world Jewry. But I added that in order to do so it must reckon with the three trends in Jewish religious life today.

The outcome of the discussion was that the University ought to encourage the proposed rabbinic institute which is to be Orthodox, but it ought at the same time encourage the other two groups to cooperate with it in their training of young men for the rabbinate. In keeping with the latter suggestion, the University ought to get in touch with the different rabbinical schools and ask them to work out curricula of studies part of which should be pursued in their own schools and the rest in the University.

* * * *

Saturday, June 17, 1939

If there is such a thing as transmigration of souls, and if what we endure in this world is a punishment for sins committed in a previous state of existence, the divinity or the satan who has charge of this business of punishing could not have devised a worse hell for guilty souls than entering into the bodies of twentieth century Jews. In accordance with their scheme the worst offenders would be condemned to become incarnate in German Jews and to be victims of Hitler's pogroms. The least guilty would become incarnate in American Jews and be condemned to read the "Contemporary Jewish Record." The morbid interest which

assimilationist Jews display in anti-Semitism may be due simply to the fear that it may ultimately reach them, or it may be a form of masochism. In any event the preoccupation with anti-Semitism is like being engaged in visiting hospitals and morgues. It may be necessary for the few professionals, but it cannot have anything but a gruesome effect on the average layman.

It is high time to put a stop to the ridiculous practice of rabbinical seminaries conducting their graduation exercises in the garb of medieval priests.

Are the concepts of God, ego, universe merely mental constructs by means of which we manipulate wholesale large groups of facts, values and relationships which our mental fingers, so to speak, are incapable of handling, individually whenever there is need for quick thought or action? Or do they represent realities over and above those facts, values and relationships? It is the old problem of the one and the many, which, if we are to believe Kant, the human mind is inherently incapable of dealing with.

These days one hears frequently the remark that we are without leaders. Usually I assent, but coming from this particular person -- Gael Hoffman, the daughter of Rabbi Ch. Hoffman -- it jarred on my nerves. "Why," I asked, "is that the case?" "Because we haven't any one good enough," she replied. Her reply aroused my resentment. The idea that no one of our present leaders is as good as Hitler was more than I could stomach. It then dawned on me that our trouble is not that we have no leaders, but that we don't want to be led.

This opens up the problem to what extent is it safe, from an ethical standpoint, to submit to authority and leadership? Certainly

nothing is more essential, from the standpoint of national survival and strength. In the past, when the Jewish leaders invoked divine sanction for his authority the average Jew submitted readily. Now that such sanction is precluded, the individual Jew must of his own accord realize that without submission on his part to some kind of authority, it is impossible for the Jewish people to survive. Naturally an authoritative code of some kind is indispensable as a basis for authority to exist. But perhaps even more important than a code is the leader whose authority is recognized. One can well understand why in a vital movement like Hasidism the person of the "Zadik" came to play such a significant role. Even so rationalistic a society as the (p.4) which Ahad ha-Am organized cantains the rule that the leader of each unit in the society, and of the society as a whole, should be obeyed implicitly.

One's attitude in this matter of submission to leadership depends upon how far one is ready to surrender one's personal freedom for the good of a cause. In our present predicament as Jews the only thing that will save us from destruction is the willingness of large masses of our people to recognize some kind of authority. In a sense, what Aristotle said about bad laws being better than no laws at all applied also to leaders. All this is true, if we believe with most thinkers that human life to be worthwhile must arise out of some normally functioning national life.

Yesterday I visited the buildings of the New Hadassah hospital on Mt. Scopus. Architecturally they are very impressive, but I have a feeling that from the standpoint of utility they are far from perfect. Mrs. Jacbos, the former Hadassah president who was one of the initiators of the project, discovered when she was here, that there were no screens on any of the windows. The excuse was that they interfered with the architectural beauty of the buildings. In the children's

ward the windows came down almost to the floor and no bars outside. Tremendous sketches of glass windows that will call for a whole regiment of window cleaners. No attention was paid to placing of telephone exchanges where they are needed, etc.

In what looked like a place for a garage or a storeroom there were a dozen cots with dirty mattresses on them. This was for the gaffirs - the Jewish police - who are charged with the responsibility of protecting the hospital against attack. The few ghaffirs who were there complained bitterly and referred to the fact that every day one or another of them took sick because of the unsanitary conditions there.

I was anything but impressed by the small room set aside for the synagogue, and the little curtained off alcove on the side for the women. The chief rabbinate dictates the religious details of the hospital.

* * *

Sunday, June 18, 1939

Schocken invited me to discuss with him at length the attitude the University here ought to take toward the rabbinic courses which will be opened the coming fall. I spent with him almost two hours during which I dwelt on the trends and personalities of American Judaism. In reference to the main question I made the point that it would be a mistake to go directly to the authorities of the various rabbinical training schools to get their consent to cooperate with the University. The first one to balk would be Cyrus Adler. The only way to go about this matter is to work up a public opinion in favor of such cooperation. That would force the authorities of the rabbinical institutions to enter into some kind of arrangement with the University, whereby it would come to play a central role in the training of men for the American rabbinate.

* * *

Friday, June 23, 1939 (Tel Aviv)

On Monday, as we were getting things ready in order to leave Jerusalem, a time bomb exploded in the Arabic marketplace in Haifa killing 18 and wounding 24. That spoiled my appetite for staying at Haifa and visiting the xxx environs before boarding the Champollion on Wednesday.

We got here on Tuesday afternoon, and are stopping at Hotel "Fish," on Ha-Yarkon St. One certainly does feel much more secure and at home in Tel Aviv than in Jerusalem.

We saw the (p.5) on Tuesday night in their 49th production. I thought it was very good. (p.6) was very well done. There was a very small audience. The following night we went to see and . The prices being popular brought a huge crowd to the where the had acted the night before. The first was a takeoff on events here, the second on events abroad. The second one was done very poorly and the audience acted stupidly and laughed at the most heart-rending moments in the play.

This type of "gallows humor" in which our people indulge all the time tears at my heartstrings no less than outright facts about our position in the world.

I am reading up at present on what I term "Realistic Jewish Nationalism" which centers its interest upon the welfare of the Jew rather than upon the future of Judaism. It is a pity that in training rabbis and teachers, comparatively little attention is paid to the developments within the last 150 years in Judaism. Even those who teach and write concerning contemporary problems are so wrapped up in their own ideas that they have no mind for what those who disagree with them

have to say. The fact that I feel more bewildered than ever as to what we Jews should do is a sad commentary on my own efforts hitherto, as well as on those of others, who like me have been struggling to discover some way out of our present unbearable condition.

We must first make up our minds as to what we consider as self-fulfillment or salvation. If it is not to be immortality and bliss in the hereafter, what is it to be? It is quite clear that beyond the possession of health, both bodily and mental, no normally constituted person can find happiness in the mere fulfillment of his physical hungers. A ~~xxrkx~~ degree of creativity (which assumes a large measure of personal freedom) sufficient to generate the sense of being wanted and loved by others is indispensable to happiness or salvation. A civilization which afford the individual a field for such activity is the medium of salvation. This incidentally, suggests a definition of civilization as a mode of collective life which enables the individual to achieve salvation.

Saturday night, June 24, 1939

The western civilizations, by admitting the Jew to citizenship, held out to him the promise that the world served as media of salvation. But unfortunately the nations which live by these civilizations have insisted upon regarding the Jew as an alien. They have not admitted him to social and economic equality and therefore cannot mediate his salvation. The assimilationist Jew tries to persuade himself that he is treated as an equal. At the same time he tries to wheedle himself into equality by alienating himself from his people.

It seems to me there are only two alternatives, either to say with Herzl, "We want to emigrate to some territory where we shall exercise sovereignty." Or if you want us to accept civic rights you must grant us at least economic equality as well by outlawing anti-Semitism from your economic order. "We must refuse to be alines. Alienage robs us of our elementary human rights to self-respect, happiness and

salvation."

Last night we visited with the Nardis (Shulamit Schwarz and her husband). She had invited some people to meet us. Among them were Schweiger, D. Levin (editor of (p.7)) Hen, Beigl and one or two others. I got into a hot argument with them about Jewish life in the Diaspora. I maintained that so far no one of our great leaders - Ahad Ha-Am, Bialik, etc. -- have done anything more than make impossible demands upon Diaspora Judaism. Others despair of it altogether. The result is that Diaspora Judaism is fast breaking up. The effect of that upon Palestine Jewry cannot be anything but disastrous.

* * *

Sunday, June 25, 1939

Whether it is because I am extremely impressionable, or because what I read happens to coincide with my own thinking, the fact is that chancing upon an account of Southern Buddhism, I was thrilled by its doctrine of the self as an illusion. This doesn't mean to say that I am ready to accept that doctrine. After all, I have wrestled with it in its modern guise of behaviorism. But purely from the standpoint of adjusting ~~myx~~ oneself to human existence with its infinite suffering, frustration and cruelty, I can't help thinking at times that the negation of the self which might make one at all times look forward to death itself as redemption is more helpful than the affirmation of the self. For even if we happen to enjoy health and happiness, we must be quite callous not to have that enjoyment marred by the awareness of the multitudes whose bodies are tortured by pain or whose minds are wrung by fear.

Walking on Allenby Road this morning I noticed on one of the building painted in huge black letters the words (p.7) This is the work of a recently organized group of Jewish terrorists, which calls itself They distribute multigraphed handbills in synagogues and other public places, and have a secret broadcasting station. Of course this resort to violence is suicidal. But the question is whether suicide is not more desirable than being forever hounded and degraded. One thing is certain: good behavior will win us the contempt of the overwhelming majority and it is hard to retain one's self-respect in the face of almost universal contempt.

It seems to me that our assimilationists have missed a wonderful opportunity by not taking up Buddhism (southern brand). According to Buddhism those who have committed sin while alive have to undergo punishment by living again and again under they have expiated all their sin. Then they enter Nirvana - the bliss of complete non-existence. What an excellent text this teaching insight have furnished the assimilationists. They could use it to prove that the renaissance of Jewish life would be nothing more than an evidence that our ancestors were big sinners in having fostered Jewish life. It would show that the author of the verse knew what he was talking about. Hence if we want to demonstrate the sinlessness of our forebears, we should have no hand in the revival of Jewish life.

This afternoon alongside the Revisionist slogan painted on walls of houses (p.8) was written the Walkers' slogan . On one wall I noticed the following of which was Revisionist and the had been added by the workers.

* * *

Monday, June 26, 1939

I have just come back from an hour's visit with Dr. F. Schneersohn which I enjoyed very much. In spite of the very concrete and useful work he does here with the children in the schools and in spite of the many articles and books that he has written on his specialty - psychology - he doesn't seem to be taken seriously here. At the University they wouldn't even consider him for any post in the pedagogy department. I confess I don't know why. All I know is that I have always found his conversation interesting, because he would always get me to see things from a new angle. Every time I talked with Buber, who enjoys a great reputation for learning and deep wisdom, I somehow went away an emptier man. Every time I talked with Schneersohn I went away a fuller man.

Probably the reason Schneersohn is not taken seriously is that he seems to base his psychology on unscientific assumptions. Yet I heard from him today how decisive facts were in spite of their failure to conform to generally accepted theories. He admitted that he, like others including Benet, had contended that intelligence tests could not be reliable, yet the actual application of them to thousands of cases has proved them to be on the whole reliable. Similarly with regard to Hall's questionnaire ~~kik~~ method which has generally been pooh-poohed, he found that it worked remarkably well in actual practice. The same applied to Freudianism, behaviorism and gestalt psychology. They can each point to facts as proof, despite the many flaws they contain from a theoretic standpoint.

Another interesting point he made was the important part played by the psychological affect of the style of many of the scientists in their writings. He pointed out Freud's method of writing as though he himself was the greatest sceptic of every one of his assumptions or influences, and in that way he insinuates hi self into the

reader's confidence. Having read Freud's Moses recently I appreciated fully this remark of Schneersohn. Another method used especially by German scientists and philosophers is that of mystifying. Incidentally he mentioned the German psychologist Klage as having failed to impress the scientific public because of his lack of style, although the content of his writings is of extraordinary merit. As an example he mentioned Klager's theory of "beat and rhythm."

Friday afternoon we saw the Habimah in (p.8)

and and Saturday night we saw the same company in

I must admit that I was not at all impressed by any of the plays. The first of these is good for children and is superior to the second which isn't even good for children, because it drags and gets boring. I am afraid I can't warm up to Sholem Aleichem's exaggerated caricaturing which he stretches to the point of snapping.

\- * * *

Friday, June 30, 1939 (On board Champollion)

We got to Haifa on Tuesday and stopped at Hotel Zion. On Wednesday at 6:00 P.M. We boarded the Champollion.

I have been reading Herzl's and Nordau's Zionist addresses. I must say that I do not find them particularly edifying. Having to create a popular movement they were probably forced to vulgarize their appeal and reduce Zionism to the simplest terms of flight from Jew-hatred. If they had kept to those terms, one could find no fault with their elementary approach to the Jewish problem. But they do once in a while take up complex issues like assimilation and "mission." Those issues cannot be discussed in off-hand fashion and yet they are dealt with summarily in those addresses. Herzl's argument against assimilation seems to me to be forced. The fact is that if the Jews are let alone they are absorbed by the general population. Witness, e.g. how

entire communities like those that existed three or four centuries ago in Italy have not left a trace behind them. Granted even that anti-Semitism is inevitable, one expects some social analysis of the causes of anti-Semitism, if one is to regard Zionism as the only solution. I was jarred by the one statement of Herzl's to the effect that if the nations won't help the Jews find a land of their own, the latter will breed revolutions.

* * *

Monday, July 3, 1939

We are now nearing Corsica. The trip from Alexandria has been very pleasant. I've managed to write out in connected form most of Nordaus' ideas on Jewish nationalism. I thought I would do the same for Zangwill and began to read (p.9) The editor's introduction led me to believe that I would find Zangwill a specious thinker, Instead it's the old story over again. You find yourself walking in alleys and sidestreets that turn and twist all the time. There is nothing of the modern layout with its simple geometric lines in the way these people write. They have a picturesque way of saying things but their fragmentariness makes their stuff fit for Bibles and not as programs of action conveying detailed direction, such as one needs in life nowadays, most especially in Jewish life.

I understand that Zangwill was disappointed in Schechter, from whom he had expected a new and helpful orientation on Jewish life. I surmise that Schechter, however, got his style of writing from Zangwill. It seems to me that their desire to be clever prevented them from thinking any of their ideas through. They give the impression that the fear of being considered pedants prevents them from working out an idea in a large number of its implications. We Jews would have been infinitely better off if some of our abler men had taken the trouble to follow some of the important ideas through their social and psychological consequences.

The more I struggle with the problem of Jewish life, the more I find myself landing in all kinds of antinomies. At times I feel it is as inherently insoluble as the Kantian antinomies. Perhaps the basic difficulty in all social problems is that we want to perform the almost impossible feat of combining objective thinking with the desire to conform to expectations. Four our life and peace of mind we depend upon a number of relatives, associates, employers, etc. whose expectations we must fulfil. To cross them in what they expect of us is to jeopardize our peace of mind and our wellbeing. What they expect of us is naturally based upon prejudice, blind habit, anything but reason. If we find that our own thinking and studies lead us to radically different conclusions from those that would be acceptable to those whose good will is indispensable to us, we have to be made of the martyr's stuff to proclaim those conclusions. Most of us prefer to suppress them, and live the lie so long till we come to believe in it. The more conscientious among us try to work out some compromise between those conclusions and the expectations of those upon whom we depend for our wellbeing.

On the other hand, is not such compromise the only way to improve the crude expectation and to introduce into them some measure of rationality? Has anyone the right to be so sure of what he regards as the truth as to invite martyrdom for its sake?

Doubts and heartsearchings like the foregoing torment me day in day out without respite, as I am trying to find some way out of the confused tangle of political, social and ethical conundrums presented by the anemolous situation of the Jewish people.

There can be no question that Ezekiel Kaufman is the most scholarly and prolific thinker we have today. I do not understand why he is not better known. The reason probably is that his writings are

all in Hebrew. Ahad ha-am has had better luck because of his brilliant style and his direct attack of the Haverei Zion movement in his day. Perhaps the very fact that Kaufman is so prolific and not given to the fragmentary type thinking which characterizes our spiritual guides is against him. No one has time to read through a book like (p.10) much less to study it. But why isn't study of it required in the rabbinical training schools? Because the problems it discusses are too vital and too challenging.

* * *

Wednesday, July 5, 1939 (On board Normandie)

When we got off at Marseilles we went to the ticket agency to arrange for the rest of the trip. An interpreter, who was a Jew, helped the passengers to make themselves understood to the officials of the a ency. Among the several languages he used was also Hebrew. We learned later that he had lived several years in Jerusalem. Being anxious to get as many customers as possible for his hotel which is right opposite the office he gets the officials to give the Jewish passengers wrong information about the trains going to Paris, so that instead of leaving at once for Paris they are led to believe that they must stay over in Marseilles till the evening when they have to take a night train. In the meantime they are induced by the Jewish interpreter to take meals and stay over for the day at his place.

Against conduct like the foregoing, the fear of (p.10) formerly acted as a powerful deterrent. The question we ought to consider is: What should be done with the concept of (p.11) if we want to have an equally deterrent effect in our day? It is the one concept about which there can be no doubt that it synthesized the idea of God with the idea of Israel in such a way as to give pragmatic reality to the former and high ethical significance to the latter. This synthesis disproves the contention of E. Kaufman that Smolenskin,

Ahad Ha-Am and the other nationalist thinkers are wrong in using nationalism as a means of revitalizing the religious values since in the past the reverse was the case: the religious values were utilized to reinforce the nationhood of the Jewish people. The truth is that the two ideas - the religious and the national - were always mutually supplementary and each was incomplete without the other.

It is evident that the motive of (p.11) is to function nowadays the Jew must be so identified with his people that he would realize that any wrong that he does reflects on the entire people. This realization must be not merely intellectual but deeply emotional. Such identification presupposes the existence of a tangible collective Jewish life, national and communal. Thus we find that in our desire to keep alive the motive we are actually striving for the regeneration of Jewish national life. We then cannot help being concerned about the quality of that national life. We want it to be of an ethically high level. This brings us back to the inevitable conclusion that if we want any ideal in Judaism to function we must make the revitalization of the Jewish people and the raising of its standard of life the two chief objects of our concern. By aiming at them we are bound to make Judaism a living vorce in the life of the Jew.

* * *

Saturday, July 8, 1939

From Bergman's account in his (p.11) of Hermann Cohen's philosophy, I am inclined to believe that there is much in common between that philosophy and Dewey's. From the little I read of Cohen's Die Religion der Vernunft I find that his method of interpretation of traditional Jewish concepts is very much like the one I follow in my "The Meaning of God". I was especially struck by his interpretation of the God concept which is almost identical with the one I give in

Reconstructionism does not seem to have made any headway. The fellowship which Ed Warburg gave to Eugene Kohn has been discontinued. The magazine has incurred a deficit of over $700. The members of the editorial board are inactive. To Milton Steinberg Reconstructionism is a matter of marginal interest. At the Seminary Finkelstein is playing the "Fuhrer" and he has the support of the trustees, Edgar Nathan, Hendricks and Strauss - (Rear Admirals) frightful reactionaries. Strauss addressed the graduates at the recent exercises and told them that they must not concern themselves with economic political and social problems for which there are experts who know much more than they ever will. Neither should they touch upon such controversial issues as Zionism, etc. They should confine themselves to religion. The alumni are in dread of Finkelstein because he controls the placement of the graduates in positions. He is deliberately acquiring power over them so as to have a hold on them. They are afraid of preaching Reconstructionism, in which most of them heartily believe, lest they incur his ill will. Mortimer Cohen who joined the Reconstructionist editorial board was boycotted by Finkelstein and his gang at his recent celebration of his 20th year in the ministry.

* * *

Saturday night, July 22, 1939

I cannot say that I do not feel hurt at the way the Seminary ignores me. The only two people connected with the Seminary from whom I received a word of greeting are Scharfstein and Romanoff. ~~[illegible]~~ (The curator of the museum with whom I seldom come in contact.) Chipkin met me at the boat and Chertoff came to see me. Finkelstein was in town the day after I arrived. He should have had the decency to call me up or drop a line welcoming me, but so far not a word. Suspecting his attitude toward me is part of what looks like a studied plan to cut me, I am

exceedingly annoyed. I know that it is foolish of me to mind the hostility of my colleagues but I can't rid myself of a sense of discomfort bordering on fear, when I realize how much more difficult it will be for me to put up with Finkelstein as president than with Adler, or with a Board of Trustees, including men like Strauss, Henricks, Edgar Nathan, Drob, Israel Goldstein, Krasne, than with the late Judge Greenbaum or Judge Lehman. Sometimes I imagine I shall be deprived even of the security of tenure (without which I could not have accomplished anything) as a result of the way these people who are now in control of the Seminary feel toward me. If I only could pull myself together and go on with my work without caring a fig about what they think of me at the Seminary. But for that my work itself would have to be much more exhilarating than it is.

I am sick and tired of the Jewish problem, which is what I am working on at present. I happened to reread yesterday the concluding chapter of "Judaism as a Civilization." If what I say there has had no effect, I don't see how anything that I can ever say will move our people to do anything about Judaism. Feeling as hopeless as I do about the future of Judaism in this country, it is veritable torture for me to restate the case for Reconstructionism.

I should like to write an article on the rabbinate to point out the following:1) The elmination of Jewish nationhood has abolished the rabbinic function of President of the Court and Head of Academy. 2) The attempt to fashion Jewish collective life on the model of the congregational Protestant church reduces the function of the rabbi to that of preacher and pastor. In that capacity, what he is actually expected to do is to praise or flatter the Jewish people as a whole, and the individual members of the congregation, the former on Sabbaths and festivals, the latter on special occasions like bar mizvahs,

weddings, funerals, etc. In addition, the rabbi is expected to console his people collectively with regard to anti-Semitism, and individually with regard to misfortune in their own lives. The cantor's job is to sing (p.13) to God; the rabbi's job is to sing them to the people.

In discussing with Ira yesterday and this morning the subject of freedom which he is working on for the doctorate, I got to the point where I realized that it was a mistake to attempt to make any affirmations about freedom as such because abstracted from specific situations, it was empty of all content and was entirely meaningless. Freedom is a quality of human acts and relationships, the desirability of which can be determined only when considered as part of some particular act or relationship. There is no such thing as freedom in the abstract but freedom of and from something or freedom to do something. The trouble with a concept like freedom is that in its abstract form it has honorific implications which render it fit material for propaganda. But when it comes to regulating our affairs the abstract principle of freedom is totally useless. I believe, for example, that the propaganda of the Nazis should be suppressed in a democracy, because they advocate violence. It is nonsense to maintain that the freedom of speech must include the freedom to advocate violence any more than it includes the freedom to yell "fire" in a crowded theater as a practical joke.

* * *

Friday, July 28, 1939

This week I have had quite a bad spell of the jim-jams brought on by further disclosures, first of the anti-Semitism that is raging in this country and is brazenly attacking the Jews in their very neighborhoods, while the police is acting very much after the manner

of the nazi police in central Europe, and secondly of the anti-Kaplanism that is raging in the Seminary and among its graduates. On Monday night (Tish a b'Ab) Dinin and Chipkin came to see me and they dilated on both topics. No ritual lamentations could have so unnerved me as did their tale of woe about the attitude of the Goyim toward the Jews, and of Finkelstein and his heelers toward me. I may be wrong, but I can't help seeing something inherently vicious in human nature, that is common to both attitudes. I mean to do as little harm to my antagonists as the Jews to the Goyim. The latter don't like the Jews and that is enough reason for their making life miserable for the Jews. The same is true of the Finkelstein crew. They don't like me, because my sense of values is different from theirs, and that is enough reason for them to harass me.

Chipkin came that night primarily to persuade me to accept the invitation to speak at the Congress on Education for Democracy. I fought him very hard as well as myself in my effort to say no to the invitation, but I finally yielded today and accepted it. The main reason I tried to refuse was that I am tired after all the work that I have put into the Chicago lectures. Furthermore an occasion like that demands that the speaker be a past master of blah. I am not even an apprentice at it. I know, therefore, how much effort I shall have to put into the preparation of the address. Why then did I back down? Because, in order to hold my own I cannot afford to jeopardize my prestige. As lecturer at Teachers College which organizes the Congress I am expected to state the Jewish case for education in democracy. Besides, poor Chipkin has put in a lot of effort into getting the Jews represented in this Congress, and he was counting on me to state what Judaism has to contribute toward education in democracy. All this means, of course, that if I had persisted in my refusal I would have regretted it afterwards and would have been unhappy.

Wednesday night I attended the Board meeting of the SAJ which I had asked Abraham Thomson to call for the purpose of considering my future relations to the SAJ. Several months ago I wrote to Thomson a letter of resignation from the leadership of that institution. But he did not present my letter at any of the meetings of the Board. This time I wanted the Board to take action on it. At first I contended that I wanted to devote whatever time was left me from the Seminary completely to literary work, to complete the few pieces on education and Judaism that I have made a fair start on. The replies of the members of the Board amounted for the most part to sheer refusal to let me go. Why should they? I don't cost them much and for the little that I do they can have a double professor and an author, etc. etc. to be dam fool enough to waste his energy on the 75 or 100 people of the most heterogeneous background and mentality who come to services. The only one who said anything original was the young lawyer Danny Rosenblatt. His contention was that Ira had alienated a certain group of members and if I would not resume activity at the SAJ that group would resign. This boiled me up but I held myself in leash and gently but emphatically I gave the Board to understand that if Ira wasn't good enough for them I wasn't and that talk like Rosenblatt's was what made me leave the Jewish Center and organize the SAJ. The fact however that such a condition existed in the institution proved that I was right in asking to be relieved of the leadership because I was no longer young and could not put up with such nonsense. Ira who had infinitely more patience than I did is far better qualified to deal with such an ugly situation than I am.

From what I can see Ira has become far more sensitized than he was years ago. I had always imagined he can stand the gaff. I am afraid he has gotten to be as bad as I am.

Really what is one to ~~dxx~~ do with our "Yidden"? Poor Moses! What he nad to endure! The worst of it is I can't get to the bottom of Ira's offense. I suspect that the Reconstructionist with its pro-underdog policy, especially in favor of labor, is the head and front of the crime, but they are ashamed to admit it, so they pretend that his religious veins aren't kosher enough. The discontented crew consists apparently of old Rosenblatt, Joe Levy, Wachman, Semel and Osserman. So that's the SAJ into which I have sunk so much hope and energy and which is referred to in the 1938 presidential message of the CCAR as carrying on an important experiment in Jewish life!

Max Kadushin still hangs on to me. Hearing that I had arrived he made the trip all the way from Camp Tabor - somewhere in Pennsylvania -- to come to see me. I was so fed up on lamentations that I forestalled getting another dose of them from him by putting the question to him: what can actually be done in our present situation to save Jewish life in America? And I myself tried to answer it, by thinking aloud and arriving at the conclusion that, if we are to work with what we have there are two things that could be accomplished: one is to organize Jewish adult study groups wherever possible. This, of course, calls for the preparation of matter for study, of which we have very little. We can't expect the average person to maintain his interest in the subject matter we have on hand so long as it will remain in its present form. The second thing is to get young people to join congregations but at the same time to give the rabbi and officials to understand that they must raise the intellectual standard of the pulpit and the emotional and religious standard of the prayers. After these two needs would be met, it would be in place to begin talking about pushing the clock 17 hours ahead (Palestine time) thus declaring Sunday to be the Seventh day. This would make it possible for the Jews to have a Sabbath. There is not a shred of hope for Judaism if Jews won't have a

Sabbath and festivals. This ordinance does not have to be instituted permanently, but renewed from year to year as in the case of daylight saving time.

* * *

Saturday, July 29, 1939

It doesn't take much to upset me. The other night about 12, as I looked through the material I was to correct the day following, I discovered that there was a page missing. It meant having to bridge the gap, which is not a pleasant thing to do when one is in a hurry. So for about an hour I was in a panicky state of mind and it took me a long time to fall asleep after that. Fortunately next morning with a little effort I made good the damage and my normalcy was resumed.

Just now I am again annoyed because I forgot to take out the watch from the trousers which I gave to be pressed. The watch is a cheap one but much more handy than the gold one I have. The loss of it is enough to upset my equilibrium for a while. Thank goodness it's all straightened out. At the suggestion of the colored maid I called up the cleaner's and sure enough the watch was there.

Although I have only a brief reference in the previous volume of this Journal to the possibility of including statutes and court decisions in the teaching of civics, I have been really anxiously looking forward to getting to work on that idea. The preparation of the Chicago lectures has necessitated my keeping that matter in abeyance. But suddenly as out of a clear sky the opportunity to bring the suggestion to the attention of the public has presented itself, and I have to look into it while in the very midst of the work on the lectures. I refer to the address which I have undertaken to give at the "Congress for Education in Democracy." What better means of inculcating democracy than by means of the specific statutes and decisions

which illustrate and apply its meaning? This is an infinitely superior way of developing democratic habits and attitudes than through the use of glittering generalities and inspirational slogans. The relation of this suggestion to what I have to say about Judaism's contribution to education for democracy is quite clear. The traditional practice of the study of Torah in which every Jew is expected to engage plus the fact that the greater part of that study was devoted to civil and marriage law constitutes an educational precedent which might well be adopted in the high-schools as part of their training in civics.

Just as it doesn't take much to upset me, it doesn't take much to thrill me. The possibilities in the foregoing suggestion seem to me to be so far reaching that I tingle with joy over them. I am quite sure that anyone in ancient times feeling the way I do about this educational suggestion, would have interpreted it as having come to him from the particular deity he believed he was in closest relationship with. Especially this remarkable chance of presenting it to the public would have been regarded by him as especially created by his deity for the sake of promulgating the idea. I am mentioning these facts in order to illustrate the truth that a psychological understanding of religious phenomena would establish a modus comprehendi between us and the ancients.

One of the greatest difficulties in the way of social sciences is that of getting people to realize that the same psychological and sociological phenomenon may be called by terms so different from one another that it takes some effort to realize that they really refer to the same thing. Only the other night Chipkin, who should have known better, expressed his objection to my using the term "salvation" to designate the belief in the world to come. He insisted that salvation

was a christological concept and was entirely alien to Judaism.

* * *

Sunday, July 30, 1939

With something of a penchant for seeing "sermons in stories" if I had lived in the long ago I would probably have wangled the "Thus said the Lord" stuff with a good deal of gusto. The sight of the circles of green around the ~~xprkl~~ sprinklers in the park lawns during these weeks of drought suggested to me what creative personalities or institutions can achieve in an environment stricken with intellectual or spiritual drought. The fact that the same play can be given radically different interpretations in the acting led me to think that the same laws of life can be enacted into a tragedy or comedy, according to the way the individual human being plays his part in life. Situations like these would be worked up into "prophecies" by the ancient prophets or into "parables" by the ancient sages.

* * *

Wednesday, August 2, 1939 Hotel Windermere, Rm. 501, Chicago

Sunday afternoon I left for Chicago to deliver the six Haskell lectures I had been at work on practically the entire time since Pesah. I got to Chicago Monday morning and took a room at the Windermere Hotel-East. From the moment I came here till now I have been busy with the lectures, working out outlines, copies of which are to be distributed to the people as they enter the lecture room, which is at the James Henry BreastedHall. Although it was very hot last night, the ~~akki~~ hall was almost full. Tonight there weren't as many present. Last night I spoke on "Traditional Judaism" and tonight on Reformist Judaism. Last night's took one hour and a quarter and tonight about one hour and five minutes. Both lectures were well worked out but I was more at ease tonight.

I got in touch with Prof. Hadon on Monday morning and his kindness and hospitality have been most refreshing. He comes each time to take me to the lecture and he brings me back to the hotel, and sees to it that the copies of the outlines are gotten out properly and in time. Why can't more of us be like Hadon?

* * *

Thursday, August 3, 1939

When I got through with the lecture last night a young rabbi (Rabbi Emanuel Green of Aurora) from these parts of the country introduced himself to me and said that he had had occasion to address a good will meeting a little while before. At that meeting Garrison of the Christian Century and of the Divinity School faculty here heckled him and harnagued the audience to the effect that Judaism as a civilization and Zionism were unAmerican in that they implied double allegiance. Moreover, this young man added, that Garrison wanted to meet me and asked whether Haydon couldn't arrange to have me come to the Faculty club for lunch. When I gave Hadon this message he promised to find out about it and to call me up in the morning. This he did and at 12:30 I found myself at a round table with Garrison and a dozen more men among whom was Roy Palmer -- all members of the Divinity faculty.

A few of the men asked me some questions about the attitude of the Arabs toward the Jews in Palestine. They wanted to know how deep was the Arab nationalist sentiment. I pointed out that nationalism was an importation from Europe which affected mostly those who had come in contact with European civilization. Garrison didn't ask any of the questions I had expected and had to leave right after I was through answering questions about Palestine. Then the general conversation turned to the question of changes in traditional prayers and hymns and I heard the same arguments, pro and con, whether the

prayers and humns should express our present needs in terms which are in keeping with our universe of discourse, as I was accustomed to hear in Jewish circles, and also the same cliches. Haydon was practically the only one who held out for worship that answered entirely present day needs. Since they weren't even curious to what extent Jews were troubled with these problems, I wasn't going to say anything, unless they asked me and I didn't.

When Haydon took me back to the hotel I asked him when he could arrange to have himself, Garrison and myself meet some time next week to discuss the matter for which Garrison and the Christian Century have been attacking me. He promised me he would.

A little while ago I was called up by the office of the Divinity School and asked whether I would be willing to give a radio talk some morning next week under the auspices, apparently, of the school. With all that I have to do while here, I couldn't accept.

The fact that I would have to discuss with Garrison the matter of double loyalty led me to formulate once again my position with regard to our status as Jews. The following is probably more to the point than anything I have had to say thus far: The dispersion of the Jews must be accepted as a permanent condition. This being the case, the Jews cannot hope ever again to become a nation with a central state to unite them. Their status must henceforth be that of a nationality with a common religious civilization as their band of unity. A civilization is a manifold of social institutions, language, literature, ethics, art and religion. While the Jewish civilization has to be religious there must be as much room for individuality in outlook, taste and self expression as in the other elements of the civilization. In this set up, Palestine -- even if it succeeds in becoming or harbor-

ing an independent Jewish state -- will not function as a central state for Jews in the diaspora. It will be only the cultural and religious center of Judaism -- their secondary civilization. This should put an end to all charges of double allegiance against those who subscribe to Judaism as a civilization.

* * *

Friday, August 4, 1939

I have just received a call from Rabbi Zwelling of Cleveland telling me that Friedland passed away and asking me to come to Cleveland to officiate at the funeral on Sunday. Hard as it was for me to refuse I simply had to. To speak at a funeral is for me a strenuous ordeal. Going and coming and mingling with the crowd for hours would be a drain on my energies. If I were indispensable I would naturally have gone, but merely to augment the ornamental value of the funeral does not justify my using up energy which I need for my routine tasks. The performance of these tasks is sure to be of more social value then landing a career which I am afraid it is futile to ask Jews here to imitate. It was the career of a "negator of the Galut" carried through with a consistency and tenacity hardly paralleled in Jewish life here. (p.19)

* * *

Saturday, August 5, 1939

The lecture last night on Orthodoxy worked out very well. Haydon described it as brilliant. The audience was larger than I had expected it to be, because a number of people who come from the distant parts of the city wouldn't travel Friday night.

The address I am to give at the Congress for Education in Democracy is coming along. The general idea is as follows: Democracy is the exercise of government and social control with a view to justice conceived as synthesis of individual social good. Before Democracy

got through with its struggle against special privilege, it was set upon by mobocracy. Representative government having failed to be truly representative is now being replaced by government by demagogy. Demagogy plays on the herd instinct, whereas representative government is intended to appeal to reason. Demagogy poses as the genuine democracy very much as Ashmedai posed as King Solomon. Because Solomon sinned his throne was usurped by Ashmedai and he had to wander about as a lone beggar. This is likely to happen to democracy. What is there in Judaism - in its tradition, religion, and education - to prevent that?

1. Its monotheism implies the unity of mankind - the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Demagogy preaches and practices the fatherhood of Hate and the hostility of man. Communism, Fascism and Nazism are different versions of Satanism with its doctrine of aggression, violence and war of class against class and of nation against nation.

2. Its distinction between the true prophet and the false prophet. The false prophet appealing to the mob mind apotheosizes the nation and proclaims the nation can do no wrong, etc.

3. Its insistence upon every one knowing the law, its sanctions and implications. The equivalent of that in general education would be converting the study of civics into the study of democracy, and the emphasis in that study upon an understanding of the meaning of the Constitution as conveyed through social legislation and court decisions (the equivalent of "oral tradition").

The fact that the Jews are the one element of the population whose very survival is bound up with the future of Democracy is an assurance of their loyalty to it. If loyalty to democracy is the foremost duty of the American, the better the Jew the better the American.

I spent this morning from 10:15 to 12:45 at the Museum of Science and Industry. Part of the time I looked around and part of the time I listened to two young fellows who ~~kxk~~ alternately explained some of the things exhibited. Naturally I couldn't see very much in two and a half hours. All I did was to look at the few models of early boats and read the explanations given, at some of the early electrical machines and at the specimens of the 92 elements ("the build-blocks of the universe"). All those things hold me spellbound when I learn about them, and I could probably go on enjoying them indefinitely if I had the time. But they also produce in me a strange sense of frustration. I find it as difficult to hold knowledge which I can't translate into action as to hold liquor. I get drunk on half a wine glass of liquor and the knowledge of many facts at a time gets me dizzy. This is probably why newly observed facts take on easily a symbolic meaning for me. This symbolization is the nearest I ever come to action.

Incidentally, this experience of mine may explain why the ancients were not given to the accumulation of factual knowledge. The reason probably is that they didn't know how to translate that knowledge into action. From this it would follow that more science contributed to invention invention contributed to science. Take, e.g. the matter of electricity. By sheer accident, if I remember ought, Galvain discovered that frogs' legs suspended on a brass bar move when the bar touches some other metal (the first and last time I heard this was in "Pop" Doremus' lecture room in 1895-6). And again it was the sheer accident of a charged wire passing over a magnetic needle and deflecting it that led to the entire development of electro-magnetism. The same is true of the Roentgen rays. Now, it was the inventions which resulted from these accicents that made possible the various quantitative measurements which are at the basis of the physical sciences.

Unfortunately the "true prophets" went a bit - nay much - too far in their denunciation of Israel. Their words have kept us alive, but their words have also embittered our lot. They have unintentionally furnished our enemies some of the sharpest weapons which have been directed at us with deadly force. When I looked through the course in Humanities at Chicago University I noticed that they include the New Testament and omit the Old Testament. At first I was inclined to resent the omission but then I recalled how much Jew hatred the Old Testament can be made to yield at the hands of a Gentile teacher and I was glad that it was omitted from the curriculum.

Here, e.g. I am reading Ezekiel and I come across in III 7 the statement "for all the house of Israel are of a hard forebear and a stiff heart." One might forgive Ezekiel this sweeping generalization although one has a right to expect a prophet to be careful with facts. There surely must have been some Jews who weren't so bad, otherwise Ezekiel's words would never have come down to us. But he oversteps entirely the bounds of justice when he adds "Surely if I sent thee to them (the Gentiles) they would hearken to thee." On what did he base such a statement? This seems to be also the main idea of the book of Jonah. Such an attitude could not but arouse resentment and rightly so.

* * *

Sunday, August 6, 1939

I had lunch today at Rabbi Teller's. I met there his brother who is also a rabbi here and a Dr. A. Levinson (30 N. Michigan Ave.) a successful physician and deeply interested in things Jewish. I met him here for the first time in 1918 - I think - at later at Carlsbad.

The older Rabbi Teller (Morris) was graduated from the Seminary in 1916 and the younger (Benjamin) in 1933. The former held a pulpit in Tulsa until he came here 13 years ago; the latter has been

here since his graduation. In answer to my question whether he was happier there than in Tulsa, Teller said that in Tulsa he made more friendships, whereas here he has more activities. When I expressed my failure to understand why the Rabbinical Assembly compared so poorly in literary output with the CCAR he properly explained that the members of the Rabbinical Assembly have much less security and peace of mind than the members of the CCAR. The younger of the brothers added that at the last convention of the Rabbinical Assembly at which there were about 150 rabbis present, 60 registered the wish to make a change and 31 were without positions. (I am not sure whether the 31 were among the 150). The main purpose for which most of the men come to the convention is to get in touch with the placement committee.

Levinson is a type of individualist Jew who insists on living in a Jewish environment but who refuses to associate himself with any Jewish organization including a synagogue. In his individualist fashion he helps various Jewish causes, especially Zionism, by initiating activities of a cultural and Hebraic type. He seems to take a special delight in the disorganized state of Jewish life here.

Probably the reason we begin (p.22) with Ps. 95 is that it contains the verse which is the basis of R. Levi's diction .

* * *

Monday, August 7, 1939

Last week Harry Schubert of the University Press Relations Bureau called me up with reference to publicizing my lectures. After I pointed out to him that it would not be feasible to have an unre-

vised report of my lectures appear in the press, we decided that I should work out a statement on the practical issues I intended to discuss in the concluding lecture. The statement was to be handed to him tomorrow but having gotten it ready yesterday I called him this morning and he came to get it and discuss it with me. He liked it very much and then began firing questions, the answers to which I suppose he might weave into the report for the press. The one question particularly which I wish to record was the following: "What do you think of the idea that ran through the Fortune article on the Jews that appeared about two years ago to the effect that Jews are their own worst enemies in that they help to create anti-Semitism by proclaiming its existence where it does not exist?" I replied that like all other generalizations about the Jews it is only half the story. The other half is that Jews are equally guilty of denying the existence of anti-Semitism even when it strikes them full force. The case of the Jews in Germany and in Czeco-Slovakia proves that the opposite of the generalization in Fortune is also true. Moral -- don't generalize when you are dealing with human beings. The inculcation of this moral might well constitute the aim of education of the social services in the high schools.

At 11:30 I had a visitor by the name of Dr. N. N. Glatzer, (1453 East 56 St., Chicago) who had attended the three lectures I have given here thus far. He said he wanted to come to thank me for them and that he was very much interested in them because he had read what I had written. He is apparently in the thirties. He taught Bible and History at Biram's for four years and came to this country about a year ago. He teaches here in Rabbi Mishkin's Hebrew High School. He prefers his work here because it leaves him time for the pursuit of his own studies. He must be a well-informed man, be-

cause he succeeded Buber in the teaching of the history of the Jewish religion in the University of Frankfurt-on-the-Main. Although at one time a follower of Buber's, he hinted his discontent with what he described as a certain narrowness in his approach. The opening subject of our conversation was the Jewish-Arab relations in Palestine. He wanted to know to what extent were the youth being imbued with the importance of establishing harmonious relations with the Arabs.

* * *

Wednesday, August 9, 1939

The lecture I delivered last night dealt with Conservative Judaism. It was well attended and evidently successful. Morrison who wrote more than two years ago the vicious editorials in the "Christian Century" against Judaism as a Civilization, hasn't missed a single lecture. After the one of last night he asked Haydon to introduce me to him and he complimented me profusely onthe lectures, adding that they taught him very much.

In spite of my resenting Finkelstein's silence on my return from Palestine, I wrote to him before I left for Chicago giving him the benefit of the doubt and saying to him that I assumed he didn't know when I was due to arrive in N.Y. Finally I got an answer from him dated July 31, but actually it left N.Y. Aug. 7. I've seldom known anything connected with him that didn't have something suspicious about it. He seems to find it hard to speak the truth even when there's no special reason for lying. And what a letter! Not a word of greeting or welcome. It opens with a downright lie. The reason he hadn't gotten in touch with me was that he thought I had left for Chicago. As though he couldn't get the girl in the office to call up the SAJ to find out whether I was in town. Or as if, even if I were in Chicago he couldn't drop a word of greeting. What a scamp! Alex Marx

wrote me a warm hearted letter of welcome, and so did Mrs. Marx, but Finky, the Provost,has to play politics.

The main contents of the letter dealt with the Halkin affair which is all Finky's doings. He got himself so entangled in his own traces that he is turning and twisting in all directions in order to extricate himself from the act of injustice he committed in first encouraging Dinin in the belief that Sima Halkin should be given the position in the Institute and then denying outright that he did so.

At the same time that I wrote to F. I wrote also to Adler, telling him of my arrival. In my letter I told him of my invitation to speak at the Congress on Education for Democracy and asked him to mention any idea which he thought I ought to stress in my talk. His letter which I am keeping here is characteristic of him personally and of his attitude toward me.

In answer to a letter from a Lutheran Seminary asking me to name the five most representative preachers in my "communion" I named Stephen S. Wise, Solomon Goldman, Abba Hillel Silver, Masliansky and Nissenbaum. I added that in case they wanted only English speaking preachers I would substitute for the last two Israel Levinthal and Israel Mattuck. I didn't spend more than about five or ten minutes in trying to think whom to suggest. I hope I'm not too far out of the way.

* * *

Thursday, August 10, 1939

Last night's lecture on "Nationalist Judaism" was very successful and well attended. The applause at the end of it was an ovation. I've learned to give a code effect to the concluding remarks. I have found that the best time to write a stirring peroration is the half hour before getting ready to leave for the lecture hall. This time the peroration seemed to be particularly stirring.

This address lasted a few minutes longer than the others. The average length has been an hour and 10 or 15 minutes. I'm quite sure that the distribution of copies of the lecture outline helped considerably in holding the attention of the audience throughout the entire time. I think that the overwhelming majority of the audience consisted of Gentiles. As far as knowledge of the subject I was speaking on is concerned it is near zero among Jews as well as among Gentiles. I am therefore pleasantly surprised at the way every one listened to what to the outsider sounds like somebody else's domestic quarrel.

Though I have the general idea of what I want to say at the Congress on Ed. for Democ." I do not find the working out of it so easy. Let me try to work it out here:

After mentioning the two factors which have contributed to the rise of mobocracy, viz: a) the stupendous machinery of communication which unites millions into a seething sea of human emotion, and b) the failure of democracy to make good its promise of bringing special privilege under control, I want to point out the principal devices which mobocracy uses as a means of fortifying itself. They are 1) xenophobia, 2) chauvinism, and 3) ignorance of law.

1) The rulers in a mobocracy know that they can gain control of the masses by instilling in them hates and fears of some common enemy who has to be augmented to gigantic proportions if he is comparatively insignificant and harmless, and who has to be invented if he is non-existent. For their purposes mankind must be treated as broken up into classes or nations or tribes that are engaged in a mutual life and death struggle. The purpose of propoganda is to fan the flames of hate.

2) Chauvinism is the method used by these rulers to arouse a megolomania in their own people or class. This is the other

function of propaganda.

3) These rulers find it advantageous to keep their followers in ignorance of whatever invokes the exercise of reason and is based on a conscious regard for justice. Since authority is the only basis of social order in a mobocratic regime the less the individual knows of how the law to which he must submit has come into being the better.

Now what can religion do to counteract these devices? While I can speak only for the Jewish religion, I cannot but feel that it is subject to the same danger as all other religions, viz: that of lending itself to evil as well as good uses. The apothegm of Satan quoting the Bible is all too true. A well known theologian (Thomas Aquinas, whose name I suppose I should not mention in this connection in the presence of Catholics) based the principle that king was not responsible to the people on the verse in Psalm 51 which reads "To thee alone have I sinned," and in 1749 (?) the English petitioned the king to withdraw the bill from Parliament which proposed granting Jews civil rights on the biblical ground that God himself denounced the Jews etc.

It would be far from the truth to say that Judaism has throughout its history, the first 1000 years of which are reflected in the Bible, taught the gospel of democracy as we understand it, whether in opposition to special privilege or to mobocracy. Judaism is an evolving religious civilization and one must expect to find in its early stages much that has become unacceptable. To teach Judaism as an eternally fixed system of truth is to prevent it from being a force for democracy. On the other hand, taught from the evolutionary standpoint as a pattern of life, the beauty and meaning of whose design unfold gradually to meet the developing needs of life in general, Judaism has a tremendous role to play as a factor for democracy. Thus it is in the light of this need for democracy that we can dis-

cern in Judaism three important tendencies with which to counter the devices of mobocracy.

1. To counter xenophobia, it is necessary to stress the significance in the Jewish tradition of the teaching concerning the unity of mankind and the divinity that is in all men. This is the main pragmatic implication of its monotheism. 2. To counter Chauvinism it is necessary to appreciate the role played by the true prophets. 3. To counter ignorance of whatever is conducive to ?(p25) and justice it is important to revive the educational practice of Torah as the study of the civil law as a means to social justice. Since the Jewish civil law is defunct, I venture to submit to religious schools the suggestion that selection should be made from the vast towers of legal decision of the higher courts and state and federal legislation which may be regarded as the authorized tradition or interpretation of the Constitution which is the principal safeguard of democracy.

Poor Haydon has his hands full. On the one hand he has the neo-Thomists -- with men like Hutchins, Mortimer Adler and lately Mr. R. Cohen (?) -- seeking to bring back catholic medievalism. They go about it most cleverly. They select the 20 or 25 most brilliant fellows in each class of students and constitute them into an honor group and then proceed to read with them and interpret the ancient and medieval classics in the medieval spirit. In the atmosphere of neo-Thomism thus generated in the campus Haydon with his humanistic modern approach to reality necessarily feels he is an alien, and is in fact made to feel such. On the other hand, the Divinity School with its sanctimonious Protestantism hasn't much use for Haydon either. Things must be pretty bad if, in speaking of attitude toward him on the part of the men on the Divinity faculty he said "In their eyes I am a leper."

I think I am beginning to understand now Arthur Rubin's place in the set up. When I asked Schubert, the newspaper man, whether he knew Arthur, he answered that he was one of the satellites of the Hutchins-Adler combination doing work with the honor groups. In other words, in addition to being a general errand boy for Hutchins, he is one of those who conducts the reading and discussion of the honor groups.

This leads me to think that, if I could get about $5,000. I would organize "a rabbinical honor class consisting of 10 students selected from the different rabbinical training schools. Each of them would receive a $250 fellowship, for which he would have to take an intensive 5 weeks' course during the summer in the Reconstructionist methodology and hand in after a year's time a paper of 1,000Ø words dealing with some phase of Judaism as a civilization and fit for publication as Reconstructionist literature. The other $2500 should go to the five members of the summer faculty who would guide the reading and discussion of these men during their five weeks of study.

I had lunch with Haydon and Garrison at the Faculty Club. The conversation for a while dealt with questions about the Masonic Order -- which, incidentally, I learned began as an attempt of the members of the Royal Scientific Society of England to formulate a satisfactory mode of worship, the Catholic Church, etc. I was waiting for Garrison to put whatever question he had had in mind to ask me. When I say that he was apparently waiting for me to introduce the subject, I took advantage of the first opening that presented itself to "play ball" so to say. He possesses sufficient intelligence to realize the sociological truth underlying the approach to Judaism

as a civilization. But what he failed to understand, despite the fact that he had read my book was that this entire approach is predicated on the basis of the conception of Judaism as evolutionary. He labored under the impression that I emphasized the clannish exclusive hereditary conception of the Jews as the descendants of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob that wanted to remain a people apart. When I pointed out to him that while this may have been the notion held by the Jews prior to the modern era, the very conception of Judaism as a civilization called for a change in that notion as in many others held in the past. I mentioned my elimination of the doctrine of our being a chosen people, as an illustration of how far I went in changinging the traditional outlook in order to bring it in conformity with the modern ethical outlook. When I explained this to Garrison, he seemed to see the entire idea in a new light.

* * *

Friday, August 11, 1939

Last night about nine o'clock I received a telegram from Prof. A. Ernest Johnson of Teachers College that he must have an abstract of the address I expect to give at the Congress on Democracy by Saturday. So I had to go to it. I first finished the letter I had been writing to Irving Solomon of the KAM Temple here, congratulating his congregation on their recent election of Jacob Weinstein. I did that at the request of a Miss Smith, the secretary of the Temple, who informed me about it. Although I don't find it easy to pen such letters, I wasn't going to postpone the letter I had begun writing. I've learned a lesson from the Halkin affair that I should attend to my mail forthwith and not fail to write when there is a doubt in my mind whether I should. If I had written to Adler asking him to confirm Dinin's request that I should invite Halkin, I would have averted the entire mess. So after having completed

the letter to Solomon I began to work on the outline and it was 1:00 A.M. when I dropped it into the mail chute of the hotel.

What wouldn't I give if I could break away once in a while from the abstract and stereotyped style of expression and liven up my conversation and my writing with journalese. This morning, e.g. as I looked through the funny cartoons I came across the expression "as welcome as a wildcat in a kindergarten". Could anything hit off better my position at the Sminary or Haydon's at the University of Chicago?

How the mind works

I have often been thinking that in spite of all that Freud has done for the scientific study of dreams, he has only scratched the surface of the tremendous field of dream life. Some day, no doubt, there will arise a special science of dreams. If I had specialized in psychology, that would have been my favorite study. I mention this because of an interesting fact which I noted a few minutes ago. In those same cartoons that I refer to above I came across two expressions (a)"as welcome as a wildcat in a kindergarten", and b) "get a roadplan to the poorhouse." That was about an hour and a half ago. A little while ago the following phrase shaped itself spontaneously in my mind: "as welcome as a roadbed in a poorhouse." I am quite sure that if I had been asleep in my mind I would have seen such a crazy combination, and probably there would have been a train into the bargain.

Now, when I analyze what really happened to make possible that phrase in my mind, I find that the two original patterns (A) and (B) got broken up and mixed up with each other. Thus when the mind is off guard the thought-patterns of its waking active life

break up. This points to the problem: What is it that holds a thought pattern together?

I had Haydon as my guest for lunch at the hotel restaurant. The story of his experiences with the faculty of the Divinity school sounded very familiar. He too was at one time being groomed for the deanship but he was too outspoken in his opinions on religion. He was told, as I was, both directly and indirectly, that he ought to keep his opinions to himself. In discussing the low mental caliber of the average student for the ministry, he pointed out that this fact is especially the case in the Christian ministry, where right at the entrance gate they have to foreswear their freedom of thought.

Just before we parted he handed me the check for $1500 for the lectures. I told him that I wanted about a year's time to expand the lectures into book form. He readily consented.

And so tonight I've brought the Haskell series of lectures to a successful conclusion. Garrison and Morrison were both there and thanked me heartily for the lecture. The attendance was very good and I was in fine fettle. I concluded with part of the 37th chapter in Ezekiel which I read both in Hebrew and in English.

* * *

Sunday, August 13, 1939, on train to N.Y.

What appealed to those two goyim was the second part of the lecture in which I gave a summary of "The Meaning of God in Modern Jewish Religion." Morrison would have liked me to assign a place to Jesus in reinterpretation of Judaism. He alluded approvingly to a lecture that Rabbi Isserman had delivered recently in Chicago, in which he apparently said some nice things about Jesus that must have warmed the cockles of Morrison's heart. If the goyim would act humanly toward the Jews, I am sure it wouldn't be long before Jesus

-- not the historical personality -- but say as described in Matthew, would undoubtedly be given credit for a certain degree of prophetic idealism. He could never become nowever one of the Jewish sancts.

Thursday, August 17, 1939

Although I was very hesitant about accepting the invitation to take part in the Congress on Education for Democracy I am very glad that I yielded to Chipkin's urging and finally consented. The address I gave yesterday morning at the McMillin Theatre was very successful. Coffin of the Union Theological Seminary spoke on Protestant education and Dr. Pagis, associate professor pf philosophy at Fordham, spoke on Catholic education.

* * *

Sunday, August 20, 1939

Friday I left for Camp Tabor near Como Lake, which is owned by Rabbi Jacob Grossman. He has been asking me to visit his camp for the last 12-15 years. The reason I went this time was that I wanted to meet the rabbis who usually spend their vacation there. If I really want Reconstructionism to make headway I must make friends among the rabbis and break down their antagonism. Like all social ideals, Reconstructionism has a political aspect to it, which should not be ignored.

Although there were but few rabbis there, I am not sorry I went because among the few some are key men. I refer to Israel Levinthal, Simon Greenberg and Max Arzt. Besides them there were the following: Kadushin, who is a loyal disciple; Louis Epstein, one of the arch opponents; Chertoff, a personal friend but unsympathetic to Reconstructionism; Lipis of Camden; Louis Grossman of Mt. Vernon an adherent; Kaufman from Paterson, a fanatical opponent; Boaz Cohen, the bibliographer and Alex Bernstine, quite an ardent disciple.

On Saturday afternoon nearly the entire group of rabbis called on me and engaged me in discussion. Epstein started the discussion by asking me to answer the following question: Since it is a fact that Jewish life throughout the past was conserved by the law, why is it that the non-religious elements in Palestine omit the reinstatement of the law from their national activities? I mentioned the fact that with the present need of eliminating all possible occasions for dissension, the Jews are wary of rasing the issue of reforming the law as handed down from the past. I added, however, that if such an issue were raised it could only concern itself with the civil and marriage laws and not with ritual observances. These cannot constitute matter for law to those who are modern minded. Observances there will be, and there is a definite tendency to create new ritual forms, but they cannot come under the category of the law.

Of interest to me in that discussion are certain remarks made by Louis Epstein who is not only strictly observant, but who voluntarily goes beyond the established rule in order to indicate his having family traditions of his own. For example, although the codes permit the eating of turkey, he keeps up the precedent established by some ancestor of his who forbade the eating of turkey. Those remarks were the following: The reason for regarding the Jewish law as authoritative need not be the belief that it was supernaturally revealed, but that its authors possessed more than ordinary human wisdom. In reference to the prayer for the restoration of the temple sacrifices, he said that in saying the prayers by himself he omitted those which alluded to the sacrifices but when he recited those prayers he felt he was not authorized to make any changes in the text of the prayer.

* * *

Monday, August 21, 1939

Yesterday at Camp Tabor I had a long discussion with Simon Greenberg on the problem of the community. He has been one of the most strenuous opponents to my idea of making not the synagogue group but the community consisting of all groups, religious and non-religious, the principal unit of Jewish life. The main reason, of course, for my unwillingness to have the synagogue the main unit of Jewish life is that it identifies Judaism with religion only in the narrowest sense of the term. If the synagogue could do what the Catholic Church does, and identify salvation with self-fulfilment in the hereafter, it would be holding out the most pwerful motive for cooperation -- eternal life. But, since it can no longer do that, the center of gravity in Jewish life must necessarily be wherever the real interests of the Jews happen to find maximum expression. But those interests must not only be Jewish; they must be directed toward a Jewish future. Here we come upon the most difficult element in the problem of Jewish life in the diaspora. The synagogue as such is practically devoid of any active Jewish interests, but it represents very definitely the general desire for Jewish survival and survival on a high level. The Jewish interests which are furnished by the various communal activities do not on the whole concern themselves with the Jewish future. This applies to the Zionist movement almost as much as to JDC and other philanthropic movements. Even though the Zionist movement contemplates a future for the Jewish people that future is limited to those who will live in Palestine. It is not interested in providing a Jewish future for those in the diaspora.

The question therefore arises: which should constitute the locus operandi for Jewish life, the synagogue which upholds the idea of a Jewish future, but does next to nothing to implement that idea, or the community activities in which the most immediate interests of Jews as Jews find expression, but where those interests do not reckon with a Jewish future? It is impossible to expect all Jews to join the synagogue as it is now constituted, or to crowd all their activities within its scope. On the other hand it is just as difficult to expect that out of the temporal or temporary communal activities there evolve a consciousness of their significance for a Jewish future. I can see that, willy nilly, I am at a point in the inquiry on which much light might be thrown by what I had to say at CCAR when I discussed the synagogue community problem. But irrespective of what I have to say in that paper, it is essential to stress the fact that the solution of this inner problem of Jewish life depends upon key personalities, especially the rabbis. The rabbi is in a better position to see Judaism organically than any other professional worker in the Jewish field, provided he deliberately undertakes to see Judaism as a religious civilization and not merely as a religious cult. The other Jewish workers lack the background of Jewish knowledge and practice, without which one lacks the very content of Jewish living and thinking, the very life material the continuance of which should be our main objective. But if the rabbi is to be the key personality in the organization of Jewish life, he must not be mainly a preacher but much more like the traditional rabbi who was an administrator of justice and the head of an academy. This he would be if he were to be principally the organizer of and participant in courts of Jewish arbitration, and organizer of and participant in the various cultural and educational activities. To be able to do that, the synagogue group would naturally have to enlarge its

scope. Where it cannot be made coextensive with the community it would have to cooperate with other synagogues.

* * *

Tuesday, August 22, 1939

Last night Dr. Simon Ginzberg came to ask me I should accept the presidency of the "Palestine Hebrew Culture Fund, Inc.

p. 30 He introduced his request with a detailed description of what he has accomplished since last fall in this country. He came here from Palestine for the special purpose of building up a supporting clientelle for the publication and dissemination of Hebrew books in Palestine. I was struck by the fact that not only were small Federations among the subscribers to the fund to amounts ranging from $100 to $250, but that the Reform rabbis both as a body and individually were cooperative. Even rabid anti-Zionists like Philipson, Lazaron, Wolsey, Rosenau were among the contributors. This shows that the advancement of Hebrew culture can function as a common factor for cooperation among Jews of the most divergent vein and backgrounds. But as in the case of Palestine itself the question arises: From the standpoint of a way of life for those who themselves know no Hebrew, what permanent value is there to giving money for the advancement of Hebrew culture? Unless Hebrew becomes part of the Jew's life here, the raising of funds for Hebrew culture in Palestine is merely a form of philanthropy. With my entire interest preempted by those factors which might beget both a way of life for the individual Jew and a future for the Jewish people, I cannot undertake an activity the purpose of which is merely fund raising for a cause from which the participants cannot or will not derive anything personally.

The news this morning of the Nazi-Soviet non-aggression pact put an end to the last shred of hope that at least in Russia the foundations of a new and better world were being laid. Of course, ever since the terrible purges began there and news of the terrible fear and espionage under which people lived there leaked out, I began to be disillusioned. In my public statements which were based on whatever I knew about social life, I could not but express despair of communism, but in my heart I kept on hoping that something good might ultimately come out of Russia. Time and again I heard that the lines between Nazism and Russian Communism were growing fainter and reason forced upon me that conclusion that it could not be otherwise. But the fact that there was no racialism in Russia made me feel that there was something radically different between the two systems. But events like the trade agreement and the non-aggression pacts concluded between Germany and Russia prove that at bottom they are both totalitarian in spirit and as such are a form of mobocracy.

* * *

Thursday, August 24, 1939

At this very moment Germany's armies may be marching into Poland (8:00 A.M., N.Y. Time) If that is the case Russia's non-aggression pact with Germany will prove to have been the match that set off the explosion. Throughout the years she has been pretending to be the great factor for peace. No doubt with her queer dialectics she will prove that war is peace and peace is war, but the fact remains that all people who had faith in the possibility of a better world as a result of Russia's experiment have had that faith completely shattered. When one bears in mind that those terrible blood purges of hers were carried through on the pretext that those who were executed had been conspiring with Germany the Stalin Regime appears to have been playing a devilish farce. For those who reposed their

entire trust in communism, there is nothing left to believe in or hope for. Of course if they had realized the implications of Marxian communism or the so called scientific socialism with its historic materialism, they should have left all faith and hope behind. Marxian communism regards faith and hope as useless baggage. But who thinks a thing through to its implications?

It seems to me that in most of the writing which deals with the present world chaos, there is not enough stress laid upon the new phenomenon in human society: the formation of great human amalgams through the rapid means of intercommunication. These human amalgams will take a long time to become human and amenable to reason. In the meantime they function like Frankensteins or Golems. Nationalism, Fascism, Communism represent effective amalgams that crush all individuality. From a theological viewpoint, they are the penalty for the greedy selfish individualsim of the capitalist regime. But they differ from supposed penalties like earthquakes and plagues in that they contain the correctives to a degree of the evils they result from. Viewed in this light what is happening now will appear not as world turned into chaos, but as chaos pregnant with a world yet to be, the creation of human amalgams that shall have the divine within them.

For the address on "The Place of Palestine in Reconstructionism" which I am to deliver at the "Reconstructionist Institute" on Labor Day weekend I have the following idea:

Ahad Ha-am was the first to formulate an orientation for Judaism with Palestine as an integral part in it. He was mistaken in the feasibility of controlling immigration to Palestine on the basis of cultural and spiritual qualifications. Events have made it into a land of refuge from destruction. But he was right in assigning

an affirmative role to the diaspora, though he didn't appreciate the conditions in democratic countries. It is necessary to reformulate his orientation to bring it in line with present day realities.

* * *

Friday, August 25, 1939

There are three kinds of people in the world, 1) those who must have their physical appetites satisfied to regard life as worthwhile, 2) those who must have their greed for power satisfied to regard life as worthwhile and 3) those who must have their yearning for reason and creativity satisfied to regard life worthwhile.

* * *

Saturday night, August 26, 1939

Lena and I are spending the weekend at Wildwood. The fate of mankind is just now in the balance. By tomorrow morning we may wake up to find Europe plunged into war, or yielding once again to the pressure and threats of Hitler. The prospect in either case is gloomy indeed. Unhappiness has invaded my own home. My poor Judith and Ira are unfortunate in their Ethan, with whom there seems to be something mentally wrong. May God help them.

This is the time when my belief in God is tested. I had to say or to pray May God help them. The alternative to such prayer or to belief in God is despair. Belief in God is the will to live. It is little else in times such as these. In normal times and under normal conditions, it is the will to live on the level of reason, righteousness and creativity. This is what God should mean to man. But so long as men live like beasts, as when they war on one another, God is a synonym for whatever can satisfy the urge to live.

The most upsetting fact about the Nazi-Soviet alignment is the absolute shamelessness with which whole nations repudiate not only sacred treaties, but even more sacred ideologies. From that

standpoint Russia's action represents far less of a change of front than Germany's. It was Germany which based her entire political and economic program on the ideal of fighting communism. Without even as much as a day's preparation the German nation is told that their bitterest foe must henceforth be accepted as the great companion in arms. And millions of human beings passively submit to such a decree, and are prepared to shed their blood in defense of a regime headed by leaders who issue such decrees. Here's the rub. How can we retain our faith in man? To have faith in God can mean only to believe that there is something in man which is divine. With the human being displaying such lack of reason and self respect, with him being the plaything of herd instincts, the most one can believe in is that man has the will to live, but not to live on the level of reason and righteousness. God is then only theblind life force.

But the question comes back, whence this protest in me and in millions of others against this low level of life, against a mere biological divinity? This protest must serve as the germinal point whence must finally issue the light. Let this protest mean the brooding of the divine spirit upon the chaos of human life and let it will the light. In time to come there will emerge a world in which reason and righteousness will prevail.

Perhaps out of the Nazi-Soviet pact there will come relief to the Jews throughout the world. The force of the violent drive against them cannot but be weakened by the elimination of the charge that they are the formenters of communism. Perhaps the Nazis themselves will give up their accursed race ideology. Idon't see any hope for Judaism even when that happens. On the contrary, its prospects are likely to be worsened - if such a thing is possible. But the Jews at least the 15 millions of them who today are treated like pariahs or near-pariahs, would be dealt with no worse than the rest of mankind.

Monday, September 4, 1939, Cejwin Camps

On Friday Sept. 1 the supreme madman of the world started the great conflagaration. God knows what the outcome will be. The mind simply refuses to contemplate the dread possibilities.

Yesterday England and France declared war on Germany. After their long record of criminal selfishness and stupidity which converted the German nation into a maddened herd, I was afraid that they might have become so corrupt as to permit this horrible creation of theirs to have its way. So dreadful has life become that one has to find relief in two such empires - or shall I say vampires - declaring war on a rattlesnake like Hitler.

Since the weekend of Aug. 25 I was busy writing out the address on "What Palestine is Contributing toward Judaism as A Civilization" which I had been scheduled to deliver at the Reconstructionist Institute. Lena came out to the Cejwin Camps last Friday.

On Saturday morning the Institute opened with a Sabbath service arranged by Rabbi Ophir. I spoke for about an hour and a quarter. In the afternoon there was discussion of the address. Between 50 and 60 people participated in the Institute on that day. I worked hard, but I became more convinced of the need and value of Reconstructionism.

* * *

Tuesday, Sept. 5, 1939

Sunday morning Ira led the discussion of the practical work to be done to spread the movement. In the afternoon Eugene Kohn read a paper on the relation of Reconstructionism to Zionism. He formulated a tentative platform which the General Zionists ought to adopt if they wanted to exert an influence on Jewish life as a whole.

Yesterday morning Milton Steinberg spoke on the problem of communal organization. He is a masterful speaker. His fluency, ~~xxxxxxxxx~~ diction and wealth of vocabulary are astounding. He certainly is an asset to the movement and could make it more powerful than Reformism, if he were to give himself to it heart and soul. The trouble is that he doesn't. He hasn't been maddened into doing it. Prashker (one of the Benderly group about 25 years ago, who long ago left Jewish education, went into Law and now teaches law at St. John's College) quoted Boaz Cohen whom he had seen the week before at Wildwood as saying that the only one of the graduates whose adherence to Reconstructionism he regrets is Milton Steinberg.

* * *

Thursday, September 7, 1939

Yesterday Rachel Rosenthal came to see me about the troubles her husband Henry is having with Nadel, the executive director of the 92 St. Y where Henry is the rabbi. Its more than 25 years since I've learned to know Nadel as a desk clerk at the Y who was on the fringe of the group consisting of Draxler, Glucksman (both of whom are dead) and a few others, he was then incapable of understanding what we were discussing. He now runs the institution which ministers to about 6000 young people, and not only lords it over Rosenthal who is a man of extraordinary intellectual and literary ability, but also sabotages his work. To be sure, Rosenthal is not an easy man to get along with. His exterior is neither impressive nor cheering, but after a single conversation with him, any one with intelligence would become oblivious of his lack of the social graces. Certainly, in an institution like the Y, a man like Nadel should be the last person in the world to yield authority over a man like Rosenthal. Apart from the personality of Rosenthal, what an anomoly it is for Jews, who keep on professing that Judaism is only a matter of religion, to subordinate the rabbi to an ignorant clerk whose main experiness consists in the flattering

of the directors of the institution.

Milton Steinberg is a member of the Board of Trustees of the Y and is trying hard to protect Rosenthal and to keep him from being dismissed. When I spoke this evening to Steinberg about Rosenthal, he told me that R's position is insecure because of an indiscretion he committed last year in writing an unfriendly letter to the old man Kaufman who had donated the auditorium in the Y. All in all it's a very nasty business. Rosenthal is not a well man, his wife was formerly a tubercular. They have two children. The salary which they get does not enable them to get domestic help. (He began about eight years ago with a salary of $40000 and is now getting $3750.)

This morning I met anumber of seminary graduates in my office at the Seminary and discussed with them the sermon for Rosh Hashanah. In the course of little over two hours I worked out with them the outline of what looks like a good sermon.

At 12:00 Finkelstein came to my office. I had made the appointment with him yesterday. The entire conversation was conducted in a spirit of quasi amity. Not even the sensitive point of the policy of the Teachers Institute - whether it is to be one of expansion or retrenchment - did anything to increase my blood pressure. I managed to maintain asuave temper all the way through until he answered in the affirmative my question about the raise of salary which the other members of the Faculty got and which had been denied me. Chertoff happened to have mentioned that fact incidentally when he came to see me about two months ago, and it rankled in my mind since then. When I protested the injustice of the procedure, Finkelstein's face assumed its characteristic satanic expression, with his lips curling into a cynical smile that is enough to drive one to commit violence. And when I added "I don't think I have done the Seminary any harm"

implying that I deserved better treatment at its hands than to be thus discriminated against his silence eloquently said "You certainly have harmed the Seminary." I choked down, however, my rising resentment and I said I would write directly to Adler asking him to rectify the mistake, if mistake it was. He tried to dissuade me from writing to Adler ~~xxkixxgxhixxkxxxxxxxxfx~~ by telling me that Adler was too sick to read any letters. He suggested that I discuss the matter with the treasurer, Oppenheimer. I did not accept his suggestion.

In the course of the conversation he intimated that he had suggested Lieberman of Jerusalem for the work that Hyamson had been doing in addition to taking over the Talmud courses formerly given by the late Davidson. He referred to Lieberman as a Talmudic scholar second only to Ginzberg. Zavli is to take over the courses in Medieval Hebrew literature. He has an eye on Milton Steinberg. Just what he expects Steinberg to teach I couldn't tell. He expressed his philosophy of the organization of the Faculty as being that of having it divided as it were into two groups - the scholars and the men of influence.

Something tells me that I am in for a great deal of humiliation and mental distress at the Seminary, such as I have never experienced with Schechter and Adler.

Incidentally, I understand now why Lieberman was so effusive in his praise of Finkelstein when I last saw him in Jerusalem.

* * *

Saturday, September 9, 1939

I am not going to services this morning because of the slovenly way in which the SAJ is handling my resignation. At the long session that was held a few weeks ago it was decided that a committee should be appointed to work out a modus vivendi satisfactory to all concerned.

I heard that the chairman, A. Thomson, tried to get such a committee together, but those whom he wanted to serve on it refused because, so I was told, they didn't have the heart to ask me to waste my efforts in the SAJ in view of the more important work I could do. Siegelstein, who was one of the men asked to go on the committee, was reported to have felt that way after he heard me speak at the session of the Congress on Democracy. This is no valid reason, however, why the question of my status should not have been taken up with me by some committee appointed for that purpose. To me this negligence proves how marginal an interest the SAJ is even to the members of its Board. This is an additional symptom of the disintegration of Jewish life.

Yesterday I met a number of Seminary students who had asked me the day before to help them with the sermons they have to preach on the High Holidays. I took up again the theme I had worked out with the few graduates on that same day. It centered upon the interpretation of the divine in man as manifesting itself through reason, righteousness and creativity. A third year student, Tenenbaum, wanted to know what to do with a congregation to which one preaches for the first time and which still operates with the conception of God as a personal being who is omnipotent. The problem for those who conceive God in this way is how to reconcile the existence of so much evil in the world with such a conception of God. This question brought home to me the fact that one of the obstructive factors in the present situation, both general and Jewish, is undoubtedly the theological lag. Why not write a book about it?

* * *

Friday, September 15, 1939

Last night the special committee of the SAJ that had been appointed by Thomson to confer with me about my future status at the SAJ met at Bernard Bernstein's home , 20 West 86 St. Present were, besides Thomson and Bernstein, Wachman, Ussserman and Harry Liebovitz. I did not succeed in being released from my official connection with the SAJ. All I accomplished, perhaps, was to have them realize that it was my wish that they learn to take Ira more seriously and that I regard the "Reconstructionist" as the most important activity of the SAJ. I am far from happy with the outcome of my efforts to devote myself finally to work which I want to do. I dread the necessity of having to officiate at weddings and funerals, especially the latter. These duties take so much out of me that I have little enrgy left for the tasks which I regard as important. There are so many of them that I have begun, and have not been able to make much headway with that I am beginning to feel a sense of frustration. There is the work on the history and principles of education into which I put so much effort while in Jerusalem. The Chicago lectures have to be expanded into a book. I have to work at courses both for the Teachers Institute and the Seminary. The SAJ has come to be nothing but a distraction in my life.

The fact that after all the years of my association with the SAJ I do not observe a single evidence of my influence on their thinking or their conduct has made me more sceptical than ever of the value of preaching. In addition the entire approach of the preacher to the material which he expounds is inherently wrong. It prevents him from studying his subject matter adequately and from learning to see a problem from all its angles. The preacher must always be oracular. So long as he confines himself to general truths he does not run the dangerof being altogether wrong, but then there is little

value to what he says. At best he creates a mood, but furnishes no answer for some of the pressing problems of the moment. If on the other hand he tries to deal with some vital question which calls for immediate decision, he involves himself in controversy. A controversial matter cannot have justice done to it in a monologue which does not give the speaker a chance to benefit from the opinions of others. He pleases those whose opinion he voices and displeases those who differ with him, but he teaches neither and himself remains uncorrected and uninstructed.

What I am saying here was illustrated by the two sermons these days at the SAJ. I preached yesterday on Creation vs. Chaos. Ira preached today on the policy of isolation to be adopted by America in the present crisis. I was not happy about my own sermon just because it stopped short of concreteness. Neither wwas I happy with Ira's sermon because it was highly debatable. I don't think that it is really possible to reason through the entire question of what American policy should be at the present juncture without having given a lifetime of study to that question. Even then one might be wrong. But to claim knowledge of what is the best policy on the basis of a few days' thought on the subject seems to me quite an impertinence.

Ira did well in pointing out siolationism as one of the basic policies of the prophets. But the moment he sought to apply it to the present situation in America he trod on dangerous ground. Isolationism might have been a wise policy in ancient times when each country was self-sufficient and contented with the low standard of life which was he result of isolationism. But in an industrialized world where exchange of goods is as esssntial to people as the circulation of he blook is to an individual, the direct application of prophetic teaching in this instance is dangerous. In fact any

direct application of an ancient principle of social life is likely to be misleading, for the simple reason that the circumstances are usually so different from what they were when the principle was first enunciated, that the ~~principle~~ principle itself has become irrelevant.

A contributing factor to what I regard as the unsatisfactory delivery of my sermon yesterday was the letter from Finkelstein that came with the morning's mail, and which I read before going to services. It said that the letter I had addressed to Dr. Adler in reference to my salary (see p.60 this typescript) had been sent to him by Mrs. Adler with the request that he attend to the matter. The idea that Finkelstein should wield such authority illustrated to me quite emphatically the moral chaos that exists in the world. I might have found it easy to talk about overcoming the chaos by means of the divine spirit in us, so long as that chaos did not hit me personally. But immediately after I felt its impact, the blow was too staggering for me to be able to retain my composure. The result was that the sermon did not become sufficiently part of me, for the words to come trippingly from my lips. I had to hunt for the right word most of the time, and the effort left me mentally and spiritually exhausted.

In the afternoon Lena, who had read Finkelstein's letter, sensed what was wrong with me and drew out from me how I felt about it. She helped me greatly with the wholesome attitude she took to it and which she communicated to me.

* * *

Saturday, Sept. 16, 1939

The fact that most of the "founding" members of the SAJ object to Ira's tackling of controversial subjects is sufficient to make me feel that Ira is doing the right thing, and that I must come to his support even if I don't always agree with the particular stand

he takes in the controversy. If I don't speak frequently on controversial issues it is because I am hesitant in arriving at opinions on such issues. I always have the feeling that I have not sufficient knowledge of all the facts involved. Nevertheless I believe that it would be a mistake to banish from the pulpit the discussion of all matters except those pertaining to verities of a general character. This limitation upon the pulpit is part of the assumption which has come down from the past that the man of religion speaks in the name of God or interprets His word. Everything that he utters is of an oracular character and will not bear contradiction. This assumption if brought down to the present, leads to a sharp dualism between matters religious and matters secular, and to a corresponding dualism between the oracular and the arguable truth. In view, however, of my insistense upon the negation of this dualism, arguable truths are as much a part of religion as oracular, if there are any such. Nothing indeed could be more salutary than for people to accustom themselves to the idea that they may repair to the synagogue or church to listen to talk on subjects of vital import to them as to the forum or lecture hall. What is important is not that religion should furnish us with certitude as that it should infuse its spirit into the very process of investigation and debate of all matters of vital import. Withal that, I still maintain that the discussion method and not he pulpit should be resorted to for the airing of controversial questions.

* * *

Friday, September 22, 1939 (p.39)

Monday afternoon I attended the meeting of the Teachers Institute faculty. Finkelstein was to have come to explain his attitude toward the question of getting some additioan instructor to make up for the ten periods which A. Halkin has had to give up on account

of his new duties at the Brooklyn College. Instead he sent in a letter in which, as usual, he evaded the issue by designating the acquisition of an instructor to take care of the ten periods in question as "expansion" to which he declared himself as opposed. The faculty realizing that it was useless to antagonize him, in fact they might fare worse if they did, decided to reply to him in humble fashion that they hoped this statement of his would not constitute a precedent for the future. There must, indeed, be someting sinister about this man, when people who would never have submitted to such an attitude on the part of Adler are so ready to eat humble pie at his hands.

Tuesday morning Dinin and O. Janowsky came to see me about accepting an invitation to speak before the Zionist group which they had organized some time ago. In the discussion with them, it became clear to me that as with most institutions and organizations of Jewish life this new group also harbored an inner contradiction. The assumption with which the organizers started out was that Zionism necessarily implied only an affirmative program for Jewish life in the Diaspora. Hence they invited discussions of diaspora problems. In reality, however, that assumption is unwarranted. Consequently, by insisting on an affirmative program for Jewish life in the diaspora, one contributed to the distraction from the main objective of Zionism that of building up Palestine. I personally am not afraid of such distraction. I believe that the success of Palestine in the long run depends upon Jewish life functioning in the diaspora. But those who are primarily Zionists should not confuse the issue by dealing with the problem in the diaspora. For my own part, I am no more primarily a Zionist than Ahad Ha-Am. I am primarily a Judaist. I would come to people who are alienated from Jewish life with the question: what are they going to do with the fact that in spite of

their self-alienation from Jewish life, they are still identified as Jews? On the other hand, psychologically Zionism seems to be a much better starting point with such people than Judaism, against which they are prejudiced, because they cannot dissociate it from the traditional religious approach.

Wednesday from ~~5~~ 5:00 to 6:00 I spent with Frank Weil (60 E. 42 St.) president of the 92 St. Y in reference to the Rosenthal affair (see p. 59 this typescript). Rosenthal had told me that when Weil became president of the Y he was advised to become a member of Temple Emanuel. This fact coincided with Weil's characterization of Emanuel as the "congregation of unwilling Jews."

I was fortunate in my conference with Weil, because I had worked out clearly in my mind the presentation of the case for Rosenthal. I did not reduce it to an issue of Rosenthal vs. Nadel. Beginning with a theoretic exposition of what ought to be the set up of a Y -- especially in view of its being maintained by directors who look upon Judaism as a religion only -- I pointed out the absurdity of having a lay administrator dictate the policy of the religious work. Since, however, in practice this kind of set up involved too radical revolution to be adopted the next best thing is to have the director of the religious department responsible directly to the Board instead of to the executive director (Nadel). In answer to Weil's statement that the YMHA did not play up religious activities as such, I pointed out to him that the YMCA was much more successful in attaining its objective of imbuing their institution with a religious spirit, not by playing up religious activities, but by having as the executive director a man who was emotionally of strong religious and Christian convictions. In answer to Weil's contention that a strong religious personality can make himself felt no matter what

position he occupies, I maintained that the conditions under which one works necessarily determines the character of the work. I therefore pleaded that Rosenthal be given a chance to show what he can do by being in the future responsible not to Nadel but to the Board.

Apparently Weil had himself given considerable thought to the question of what ought to be the proper set up in the Y and had arrived at a practically similar conclusion. At the end of the interview he thanked me for having supplied him with the philosophy of what he himself had come to believe as to the part that the religious work ought to occupy in the activities of the Y.

Next day a committee consisting of E. L. Solomon, Milton Steinberg, Simon Gottschal and Nadel came to see Weil in reference to Rosenthal. He told them that he had decided to have Rosenthal responsible directly to the Board. Apparently my seeing him did some good.

Yesterday afternoon I attended the meeting of the Seminary faculty. This time I came into open clash with Finkelstein and suffered as humiliating a defeat as did Poland at the hands of Hitler. This happened in the discussion of suggested changes in the curriculum. After Hyamson's suggestions and those made by Finkelstein and the men in charge of the Bible teaching, I asked Louis Ginzberg, who acted as chairman in place of Adler, why I had not been requested to send in suggestions. Instead I was handed a copy of suggestions drawn up by the four men who had given the courses in Homiletcis during my absence -- Levinthal, Goldstein, Greenberg and Steinberg. In their report they took occasion to make the sweeping statement that "the students do not learn to preach at the Seminary." The reply was that the request was not sent to me because the idea of discussing the

curriculum was taken up only last May and the office waited till I was back to inform me of that request. (Then why did the office have to wait till yesterday? I didn't put this question because I saw that the odds were against me.)

But the worst blow came when I touched upon Finkelstein's suggestion which centered upon the need of having a course at the Seminary which would present a systematic Jewish Theology. He suggested Milton Steinberg as the man that ought to give the course. I felt that I ought to mention the fact that the main part of my work in Homiletics, necessarily consisted of the presentation of a systematic Jewish theology as the basis of what the men were to preach. The answer came at once from Louis Ginzberg that my work dealt with theology only in incidental fashion. It was therefore necessary to have someone give it for its own sake. This of course was supported by Finkelstein. Then the old babbler Hyamson repeated his long disquisition on Homiletics in which he - in his pastoral fashion - condemned the very idea of a theology having anything to do with Homiletics. The proper function of Jewish Homiletics is to give the men the traditional sources -- Midrash, Talmud, medieval sermons -- but not a philosophy of Judaism. That each man must arrive at for himself.

After the faculty meeting broke up I followed Finkelstein to his office to argue the point further. I only got deeper into the bog by indicating that my main interest was not in the Homiletical technique, but in the underlying philosophy of religion. He had the advantage over me in being able to contend that such a suggestion was not within his scope to deal with. He would not declare himself on that question before consulting Adler. No amount of my practically begging him to express his opinion as a friend elicited a reply from him. He finally rose as a sign that he had to leave. I went away a broken man.

There was no use arguing that my book on "The Meaning of God in Modern" etc plus the chapters on religion in the other two books was as good systematic theology as anything in Niebuhr and Lyman whom he held up as examplars of what he had in mind. He would have pooh-poohed the idea. It is so easy to make nothing of anything one wants to disparage. If I were inclined to accept the Seminary's attitude to belittle my work, I would regain my self-confidence from a letter like the one I received this morning from Dr. N. Glatzer who is a scholar and a seeker after the truth.

At times the mental torment to which the Seminary subjects me makes me extremely depressed to the point of giving rise to insane wishes. But then I remind myself of what I have to say from the pulpit and apply it to myself. I spoke of Creation vs. Chaos only a few days ago. This situation at the Seminary is itself part of the universal chaos of greed for power and of unreason. I should indeed welcome the opportunity of experiencing at first hand the sinister reality of this chaos, its hampering and its sabotaging of reason and good will. Why should I expect to lead a sheltered life when there is so much suffering in the world due to man's cruelty to man? In fact, in those moments when I forgot my experiences at the Seminary I was ashamed of my security. So now I ought to be grateful for having this hateful object to contend with and to rob me of my peace of mind.

* * *

Thursday, September 28, 1939

Begruding the time spent on sermonizing I came to the services with a bare outline of the idea I was to expound this morning. As a matter of fact I had occasion to repeat the substance of the sermon to three different people and I managed to make my point clear to them. But when I got into the pulpit I was seized with what is

ordinarily termed stage fright. Actually it was not that. It was a fit of inarticulateness. There was, of course, the unconducive atmosphere of the audience -- heterogeneous to the extreme, looking as far as I could see all the elements of cohesiveness and insulated from me by many rows of empty seats. But I do not blame the audience for my failure. If I had worked on my idea sufficiently I might have developed enough heat to fuse the heterogenity into something of common mindedness and to break down the insulation. To achieve this result I would have to spend at least three full days on a sermon. I cannot get myself to waste so much of my time and energy when I consider how ephemeral is the effort of the best of sermons.

The foregoing paragraph itself is a concrete illustration of what I mean by a "fit of inarticulateness." The ideas do not fall readily into their places. I make false starts. Sometimes I manage to get back on the right track without having to begin the sentence again. At other times I have to retrace my steps. All in all the going is far from smooth.

* * *

Saturday night, Sept. 30, 1939

The Yom Kippur services in the SAJ have been the one activity which has borne tangible evidence of the Reconstructionist approach and of the improvement that it can effect in Judaism and in the Jew. A goodly number of those who participate in those services appreciate to what extent they are spared the boredom with which Yom Kippur would otherwise affect them. The "Shir Hadash" which Eugene Kohn edited and which was used extensively during the services, contributed to their success.

This does not mean to say that I am fully satisfied with services as they are now conducted or with their general content. Something radically different is needed to get the most out of so much time spent in the synagogue. There should be more of instruction and of discussion. Take, for example, the ten days of special services from the first of Rosh Hashanah to the Shabbat Bereshith. If such a period were approached as a time for the holding of a congress for the consideration of Jewish problems and religious services consisted only of brief prayers and community singing at the beginning and close of each session, what might not be accomplished both materially and spiritually for the welfare of our people. But with human nature being as inert and irrational as it is, such an ideal is bound to remain wildly utopian.

God and self

I have read through this week nearly the whole of "God and Man's Destiny" by Alexander. The subtitle of the book describes it as "Inquiries into the Metaphysical Foundations of Faith." Its style has beauty that is breathtaking and its thought content is rich in suggestion. Yet I cannot say that I have learned from it more than the fact that one's self must in the last analysis constitute the only source of one's experience of the reality of God. That much I have always known, but just how to go about exploring one's self to get at that experience the book does not make clear. There are a number of helpful hints in the book - like the one about realizing that one's self has as many bodies as react to its influence - but there is in it no sustained methodology.

* * *

Tuesday, October 3, 1939

This morning my brother-in-law Edward Rubin died as a result of an accident. A few days ago as he was calling for his morning newspaper through the dumbwaiter shaft the dumbwaiter went down on his head and threw him down to the bottom of the shaft. He had had a bad heart and was unable to overcome the effect of his internal injuries.

He was a peculiar type of man. He came as a poor youth to this country and ended by being the head of a great concern. He had a remarkable head for business. He owed his success in it as much to a strong sense of business honesty as to his shrewd insight. But in his personal relations he was on the whole quite a crank. His inner life was tense and stormy. Yet he somehow elicited from his children a loyalty - not love - which had nothing to do with their dependence upon him.

I began teaching at the Teachers Institute on Sunday, Sept. 17. I did not find teaching in Hebrew the strain it was before I went to Palestine. Nevertheless when it came to delivering the opening talk last Sunday (Oct. 1) at the Students' Assembly I found myself to a large extent under the same handicap as in previous years. My poor memory stands in the way of my being fluent as a public speaker. I lack all powers of concrete illustration and I have to grope for my words even in English. These difficulties are augmented a hundred fold when translated into Hebrew.

In spite of the many years I have been teaching at the Institute the subject "Jewish Religion," I have not succeeded in working out the subject matter to my own satisfaction. This year I am trying out something new. With the third year students I am reading the

section on Judaism in Vol. II of G. F. Moore's History of Religions. This is to be followed by Kaufmann's (p.44) תולדות האמונה הישראלית With the fourth year class I am trying out something new. I am taking the fundamental religious concepts in the order in which they occur in the Bible and translating them into terms of experience which a modern minded person can identify.

The first two lessons were devoted to the description of the range of experience of a modern minded person. That range has been widened as a result of the following principle discovered by ancient philosophy (1) that the senses are no guide to reality; (2) that the relationships which fall under the various categories of thought are real in the sense that they make a difference in the essence and operation of things and persons. In addition there are the following principles discovered by modern philosophy: (1) that because of our inability to think and discourse about relational realities we fall into the tendency to hypostasize them and into all kinds of errors as a result of such hypostasis. (2) that of the various relationships those which belong to the category of values are no less real than those that belong to the category of space, time, cause, etc. (3) that the very ground of all reality - mind is the least capable of being named or described. Whatever we can know about it is not its nomenal but phenomenal aspect. Yet we experience its reality with an immediacy which cannot belong to any of its objects. On the other hand this experience is non-communicable whereas that of its objects is communicable.

The point which I then made was that mind which is the very ground of reality and experience is experienced as self on the hither end, and as God on the end of one's self. This makes self and God correlative terms. The fact is that self has always been a correlative term. What the correlate was depended upon the cultural

and social development of the individual. Usually the correlate was the most inclusive group. Its totem idol, ~~g~~ flag or other sancta were the gods which served as correlates. By this time nothing less than the cosmos will satisfy the individual as being the seat of the correlate to the self. Hence his God is no longer tribal or national but cosmic.

I believe that the foregoing assumption that self and God are correlative terms might form the starting point of an interesting adventure in thought.

Chancing to meet Milton Steinberg at the SAJ today I opened up to him about my tilt with Finkelstein at the last meeting of the Seminary faculty. I find it a pleasure to talk with Steinberg because he is transparently honest. I don't have to suspect any mental reservations in whatever he tells me. As a result of the conversation I had with him this afternoon I became clear in my own mind as to what he ought to do in order not to be used by Finkelstein as a pawn to checkmate the Reconstructionist movement. If he would accept the invitation to conduct the Seminar in systematic theology as Finkelstein proposed at the Faculty meeting, he would necessarily compromise whatever work in theology and philosophy of Judaism I give as part of the course in Homiletics. It would come to be regarded as contraband which I smuggle in under the name of Homiletics. I therefore suggested to him that if he is offered the post in theology, he should insist upon coordinating his work with my the work in my department as well as with that of Finkelstein. He agreed heartily with any suggestion and promised to show me and have me pass on the letter he would write in answer to an invitation from the Seminary.

* * *